Improved estimators for a general class of beta regression models

Alexandre B. Simas[a,*], Wagner Barreto-Souza[b,†] and Andréa V. Rocha[b,‡]

[a]Associação Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, IMPA,
Estrada D. Castorina, 110, Jd. Botânico, 22460-320, Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brasil
[b]Departamento de Estatística, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco,
Cidade Universitária, 50740-540, Recife-PE, Brasil

arXiv:0809.1878v1 [stat.ME] 10 Sep 2008

Abstract

In this paper we consider an extension of the beta regression model proposed by Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004). We extend their model in two different ways, first, we let the regression structure be nonlinear, second, we allow a regression structure for the precision parameter, moreover, this regression structure may also be nonlinear. Generally, the beta regression is useful to situations where the response is restricted to the standard unit interval and the regression structure involves regressors and unknown parameters. We derive general formulae for second-order biases of the maximum likelihood estimators and use them to define bias-corrected estimators. Our formulae generalizes the results obtained by Ospina et al. (2006), and are easily implemented by means of supplementary weighted linear regressions. We also compare these bias-corrected estimators with three different estimators which are also bias-free to the second-order, one analytical and the other two based on bootstrap methods. These estimators are compared by simulation. We present an empirical application.

Keywords: Beta distribution; Beta regression; Dispersion Covariates; Nonlinear Models; Bias Correction

1 Introduction

The beta distribution is a very flexible distribution and thus is commonly used to model data restricted to some open interval on the line. The application turns to be more interesting when the interval which is being used is the standard unit interval, $(0, 1)$, since the data can be interpreted as rates or proportions. To work with this distribution in a regression manner, several models were defined, see for instance, Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004), Kieschnick and McCullough (2003), Paolino (2001), Vasconcellos and Cribari-Neto (2005), among others. But the one we will use here is an extension of the one defined by Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004), mainly because this model is similar to the well known class of generalized linear models (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989). Our objective in this paper is to reduce the bias of the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) for this extended class of beta regression models.

We extend the model defined by Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) in two ways, namely: (i) We allow the regression structure to be nonlinear, such as the exponential family nonlinear models (Cordeiro and Paula, 1989) extend the generalized linear models. (ii) We allow a regression structure on the precision parameter, this extension is similar to the way the generalized linear models with dispersion covariates (e.g., Botter and Cordeiro, 1998) extend the generalized linear models. Further, we allow the regression structure on the precision parameter to be nonlinear, an immediate consequence is that we are able to model heteroscedasticity in a natural way, by means of this regression structure. Furthermore, we do not place any restrictions about the dispersion covariates, in the sense that it can be, and usually is, a subset of the covariates of the mean. Moreover, if we see the section on numerical results and the section

*Corresponding author. E-mail: alesimas@impa.br
†E-mail: wagnerbs85@hotmail.com
‡E-mail: dearocha@yahoo.com

on application to real data of Ospina et al. (2006), we are able to see that the precision parameter, usually has a large variance, thus is not sharply estimated, we then expect the dispersion covariates to circumvent this problem.

The problem of modeling variances has been largely discussed in the statistical literature particularly in the econometric area (see, for instance, Park, 1966; Harvey, 1976). Under normal errors, for instance, Cook and Weisberg (1983) and Atkinson (1985) present some graphical methods to detect heteroscedasticity, Carrol and Ruppert (1988) develop diagnostic procedures using local influence methods for the variance parameter estimates in various nonlinear models for the mean, whereas Verbyla (1993) compares full and residual maximum likelihood estimates based on case deletion and likelihood displacement. Moving away from normal errors, Smyth (1989) describes a method which allows modeling the dispersion parameter in some generalized linear models whereas Botter and Cordeiro (1997) present Bartlett correction expressions to improve likelihood ratio test in generalized linear models with dispersion covariates. Barroso et al. (2002) present expressions to improve score tests in heteroscedastic Student-t models and more recently Taylor and Verbyla (2004) propose a joint modeling of location ans scale parameters in Student-t models. Finally, Cysneiros et al. (2007) consider heteroscedastic linear models with symmetric errors and discusses the diagnostic aspects of these models.

It is known that MLEs in nonlinear regression models are generally biased. These bias become problematic when the study is being done in small samples. Bias does not pose a serious problem when the sample size n is large, since its order is typically $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, whereas the asymptotic standard error has order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$. Several authors have explored bias in regression models. Pike et al. (1979) investigated the magnitude of the bias in unconditional estimates from logistic linear models, when the number of strata is large. Ratkwosky (1983) uses various examples of normal nonlinear models to relate bias to the parameter effects curvature. Also for this class of models, Cook et al. (1986) show that the bias may be due to the explanatory variables position in the sample space. Cordeiro and McCullagh (1991) gave a general bias formulae in matrix notation for generalized linear models.

Bias corrected versions of the MLEs of the parameters that index the beta distribution were obtained by Cordeiro et al. (1997) and Cribari-Neto and Vasconcellos (2002). However, such results do not hold for models with regression structures. Ospina et al. (2006) obtained expressions for the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the parameters of the beta regression models (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004).

The method used to obtain expressions of the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the parameters of this class of beta regression models is the one given by Cox and Snell (1968). Further, an alternative approach was proposed by Firth (1993). He suggested a *preventive* method of bias reduction by modifying the score function prior to obtaining the parameter estimates. It is also possible to perform bias adjustment using the estimated bias from a bootstrap resampling scheme, which requires no explicit derivation of the bias function.

The chief goal of this paper is to obtain closed-form expressions for the second order biases of the MLEs of the parameters, of the means of the responses, and of the precision parameters of the model. The results are used to define bias corrected estimators to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$. We also consider bootstrap bias adjustment and the bias adjustment given by Firth (1993).

The rest of this paper unfolds as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the general class of beta regression of interest along with the score function and Fisher's information matrix. In Section 3, we derive a matrix expression for the second order biases of the MLEs of the parameters, and consider analytical (corrective and preventive) and bootstrap bias correction schemes. We also show how the biases of the MLEs of the parameters can be easily computed by means of auxiliary weighted linear regressions. In Section 4, we obtain the second order biases of the MLEs of the means of the responses and precision parameters of the model. In Section 5, we consider some special cases in detail. In Section 6, we present simulation results that show that the proposed estimators have better performance in small samples, in terms of bias, than the original MLEs. In Section 7, we consider an empirical example. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section 8 with some final remarks.

2 The model

We say that a random variable Y follows a beta distribution with parameters $p, q > 0$, denoted by $B(p, q)$, if the distribution of Y admits the following density with respect to the Lebesgue measure:

$$f(y; p, q) = \frac{\Gamma(p+q)}{\Gamma(p)\Gamma(q)} y^{p-1}(1-y)^{q-1}, \quad y \in (0,1), \tag{1}$$

where, $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function. The mean and variance of Y are, respectively

$$E(Y) = \frac{p}{p+q} \text{ and } \mathrm{Var}(Y) = \frac{pq}{(p+q)^2(p+q+1)}.$$

Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) defined a regression structure for beta distributed responses that differs from (1). Let $\mu = p/(p+q)$ and $\phi = p+q$, i.e., $p = \mu\phi$ and $q = (1-\mu)\phi$. Under this new parameterization, if $Y \sim B(p, q)$, then $E(Y) = \mu$ and $\mathrm{Var}(Y) = V(\mu)/(1+\phi)$, where $V(\mu) = \mu(1-\mu)$ denotes a "variance function", under this parameterization, we will use the notation $Y \sim \mathcal{B}(\mu, \phi)$. We also note that this parameterization was already known in the statistical literature (see, for instance, Jørgensen, 1997, p. 33). Further, ϕ plays the role of a precision parameter, in the sense that, for fixed μ, the larger the ϕ, the smaller the variance of the response. Using this new parameterization, the beta density in (1) can be written as

$$f(y; \mu, \phi) = \frac{\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\mu\phi)\Gamma((1-\mu)\phi)} y^{\mu\phi-1}(1-y)^{(1-\mu)\phi-1}, \quad y \in (0,1), \tag{2}$$

and the log-density is thus

$$\log f(y; \mu, \phi) = \log\Gamma(\phi) - \log\Gamma(\mu\phi) - \log\Gamma((1-\mu)\phi) + (\mu\phi)\log y + \{(1-\mu)\phi - 1\}\log(1-y),$$

with, $0 < \mu < 1$ and $\phi > 0$, since $p, q > 0$.

Let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$ be a random sample, where $y_i \sim \mathcal{B}(\mu_i, \phi_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Suppose the mean and the precision parameter of y_i satisfies the following functional relations:

$$g_1(\mu_i) = \eta_{1i} = f_1(x_i^T; \beta) \text{ and } g_2(\phi_i) = \eta_{2i} = f_2(z_i^T; \theta), \tag{3}$$

where $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)^T$ and $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_h)^T$ are vectors of unknown regression parameters which are assumed to be functionally independent, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^h$, $k + h < n$, η_{1i} and η_{2i} are predictors, and $x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{iq_1}, z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{iq_2}$ are observations on q_1 and q_2 *known* covariates, which need not to be exclusive. We assume that the derivative matrices $\tilde{X} = \partial\eta_1/\partial\beta$ and $\tilde{Z} = \partial\eta_2/\partial\theta$ have rank k and h, respectively. Moreover, we assume that the link functions $g_1 : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_2 : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ are strictly monotonic and twice differentiable. A number of different link functions can be used, such as the logit specification $g_1(\mu) = \log\{\mu/(1-\mu)\}$, the probit function $g_1(\mu) = \Phi^{-1}(\mu)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ denotes the standard normal distribution function, the complementary log-log function $g_1(\mu) = \log\{-\log(1-\mu)\}$, among others, and for g_2, $g_2(\phi) = \log\phi$, the logarithmic function, $g_2(\phi) = \sqrt{\phi}$, the square root function, $g_2(\phi) = \phi$ (with special attention on the positivity of the estimates), among others. A rich discussion of link functions can be found in McCullagh and Nelder (1989); see also Atkinson (1985, Chapter 7).

The log-likelihood function for this class of beta regression models has the form

$$\ell(\beta, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell_i(\mu_i, \phi_i), \tag{4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(\mu_i, \phi_i) &= \log\Gamma(\phi_i) - \log\Gamma((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) + (\mu_i\phi_i - 1)\log y_i \\ &\quad + \{(1-\mu_i)\phi_i - 1\}\log(1-y_i); \end{aligned}$$

$\mu_i = g_1^{-1}(\eta_{1i})$, $\phi_i = g_2^{-1}(\eta_{2i})$, as defined in (3), are functions of β and θ, respectively. It is possible to show that this beta regression model is regular, in the sense that all the regularity conditions described in Cox and Hinkley (1974, p. 107) hold. It is also possible to show that the MLEs are unique.

The components of the score vector, obtained by differentiation of the log-likelihood function with respect to the parameters, are given, for $r = 1, \ldots, k$, as

$$U_r(\beta, \theta) = \frac{\partial \ell(\beta, \theta)}{\partial \beta_r} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i (y_i^* - \mu_i^*) \frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}} \frac{\partial \eta_{1i}}{\partial \beta_k},$$

where $d\mu_i/d\eta_{1i} = 1/g_1'(\mu_i)$, $y_i^* = \log(y_i/(1-y_i))$, $\mu_i^* = \psi(\mu_i\phi_i) - \psi((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)$, and $\psi(\cdot)$ is the digamma[1] function, together with

$$U_R(\beta, \theta) = \frac{\partial \ell(\beta, \theta)}{\partial \theta_R} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \mu_i (y_i^* - \mu_i^*) + \psi(\phi_i) - \psi((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) + \log(1-y_i) \right\} \frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} \frac{\partial \eta_{2i}}{\partial \theta_R},$$

where $d\phi_i/d\eta_{2i} = 1/g_2'(\phi_i)$, and $R = 1, \ldots, h$. Further, the regularity conditions implies that

$$E\left(\log \frac{y_i}{1-y_i} \right) = \psi(\mu_i\phi_i) - \psi((1-\mu_i)\phi_i),$$

and

$$E\{\log(1-y_i)\} = \psi((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \psi(\phi_i).$$

Consider the complete parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \theta^T)^T$. Define the vectors $y^* = (y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*)^T$, $\mu^* = (\mu_1^*, \ldots, \mu_n^*)^T$, $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)^T$, the matrix $T_1 = \mathrm{diag}(d\mu_i/d\eta_{1i}), T_2 = \mathrm{diag}(d\phi_i/d\eta_{2i})$, $\Phi = \mathrm{diag}(\phi_i)$, with $\mathrm{diag}(\mu_i)$ denoting the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with typical element $\mu_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$, and where $v_i = \mu_i(y_i^* - \mu_i^*) + \psi(\phi_i) - \psi((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) + \log(1-y_i)$. Therefore, we can write the $(k+h) \times 1$ dimensional score vector $U(\zeta)$ in the form $(U_\beta(\beta, \theta)^T, U_\theta(\beta, \theta)^T)^T$, with

$$\begin{array}{rcl} U_\beta(\beta, \theta) & = & \tilde{X}^T \Phi T_1 (y^* - \mu^*), \\ U_\theta(\beta, \theta) & = & \tilde{Z}^T T_2 v. \end{array} \tag{5}$$

The MLEs of β and θ are obtained as the solution of the nonlinear system $U(\zeta) = 0$. In practice, the MLEs can be obtained through a numerical maximization of the log-likelihood function using a nonlinear optimization algorithm, e.g., BFGS. For details, see Press et al. (1992).

Define P as the $2n \times (k+h)$ dimensional matrix

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{Z} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Also, let W be the $2n \times 2n$ matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} W_{\beta\beta} & W_{\beta\theta} \\ W_{\beta\theta} & W_{\theta\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

with

$$\begin{array}{rcl} W_{\beta\beta} & = & \mathrm{diag}\left(\phi_i^2 a_i \left(\dfrac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}} \right)^2 \right), \\ W_{\beta\theta} & = & \mathrm{diag}\left(\phi_i \{ \mu_i a_i - \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) \} \left(\dfrac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}} \right) \left(\dfrac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} \right) \right), \\ W_{\theta\theta} & = & \mathrm{diag}\left(b_i \left(\dfrac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} \right)^2 \right). \end{array}$$

Here, $a_i = \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) + \psi'(\mu_i\phi_i)$ and $b_i = \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)(1-\mu_i)^2 + \psi'(\mu_i\phi_i)\mu_i^2 - \psi'(\phi_i)$. Now, using (6) and (7), it is possible to obtain Fisher's information matrix for the parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \theta^T)^T$ as

$$K(\zeta) = P^T W P.$$

[1] We denote generally the polygamma function by $\psi^{(m)}(\cdot)$, $m = 0, 1, \ldots$, where $\psi^{(m)}(x) = \left(d^{m+1}/dx^{m+1} \right) \log \Gamma(x), x > 0$.

Note that $W_{\beta\theta} \neq 0$, thus indicating that the parameters β and θ are not orthogonal, in constrast to the class of generalized linear models (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989), where such orthogonality holds. Nevertheless, the MLEs $\hat{\zeta}$ and $K(\hat{\zeta})$ are consistent estimators of ζ and $K(\zeta)$, respectively, where $K(\hat{\zeta})$ is the Fisher's information matrix evaluated at $\hat{\zeta}$. Assuming that $J(\zeta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} K(\zeta)/n$ exists and is nonsingular, we have that $\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\zeta} - \zeta\right) \xrightarrow{d} N_{k+h}(0, J(\zeta)^{-1})$, where, $\xrightarrow{d}$ denotes convergence in distribution. Hence if ζ_r denotes the rth component of ζ, it follows that

$$\left(\hat{\zeta} - \zeta\right)\{K(\hat{\zeta})^{rr}\}^{-1/2} \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1),$$

where $K(\hat{\zeta})^{rr}$ is the rth diagonal element of $K(\hat{\zeta})^{-1}$. Let $K(\hat{\zeta})^{RR}$ be the $(k+R)$th diagonal element of $K(\hat{\zeta})^{-1}$. Then, if $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, and q_γ represents the γ quantile of the $N(0,1)$ distribution, we have, for $r = 1, \ldots, k$, $\hat{\beta}_r \pm q_{1-\alpha/2}\left(K(\hat{\zeta})^{rr}\right)^{1/2}$ and $\hat{\theta}_R \pm q_{1-\alpha/2}\left(K(\hat{\zeta})^{RR}\right)^{1/2}$ as the limits of asymptotic confidence intervals for β_r and θ_R, respectively, both with asymptotic coverage of $100(1-\alpha)\%$. The asymptotic variances of $\hat{\beta}_r$ and $\hat{\theta}_R$ are estimated by $K(\hat{\zeta})^{rr}$ and $K(\hat{\zeta})^{RR}$, respectively.

3 Bias correction of the MLEs of β and θ

We begin by obtaining an expression for the second order biases of the MLEs of β and θ in this general class of beta regression models using Cox and Snell's (1968) general formula. With this expression we will be able to obtain bias corrected estimates of the unknown parameters.

We now introduce the following total log-likelihood derivatives in which we reserve lower-case subscripts $r, s, t, u, \ldots$ to denote components of the β vector and upper-case subscripts $R, S, T, U, \ldots$ for components of the θ vector: $U_r = \partial\ell/\partial\beta_r$, $U_{rS} = \partial^2\ell/\partial\beta_r\theta_S$, $U_{rsT} = \partial^3\ell/\partial\beta_r\partial\beta_s\partial\theta_T$, and so on. The standard notation will be adopted for the moments of the log-likelihood derivatives (Lawley, 1956): $\kappa_{rs} = E(U_{rs})$, $\kappa_{r,s} = E(U_r U_s)$, $\kappa_{rs,T} = E(U_{rs}U_T)$, etc., where all κ's to a total over sample and are, in general, of order $\mathcal{O}(n)$. We define the derivatives of the moments by $\kappa_{rs}^{(t)} = \partial\kappa_{rs}/\partial\beta_t$, $\kappa_{rs}^{(T)} = \partial\kappa_{rs}/\partial\theta_T$, etc. Not all the κ's are functionally independent. For example, $\kappa_{rs,t} = \kappa_{rst} - \kappa_{rs}^{(t)}$ gives the covariance between the first derivative of $\ell(\beta,\theta)$ with respect to β_t and the mixed second derivative with respect to β_r, β_s. Further, let $\kappa^{r,s} = -\kappa^{rs}$, $\kappa^{R,s} = -\kappa^{Rs}$, $\kappa^{r,S} = -\kappa^{rS}$ and $\kappa^{R,S} = -\kappa^{RS}$ be typical elements of $K(\zeta)^{-1}$, the inverse of the Fisher's information matrix, which are $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$.

Let $B(\hat{\zeta}_a)$ be the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the MLE for the ath component of the parameter vector $\hat{\zeta} = (\hat{\zeta}_1, \ldots, \hat{\zeta}_k, \hat{\zeta}_{k+1}, \ldots, \hat{\zeta}_{k+h}) = (\hat{\beta}^T, \hat{\theta}^T)^T$. From the general expression for the multiparameter $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases of the MLEs given by Cox and Snell (1968), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
B(\hat{\zeta}_a) &= \sum_{r,s,u} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{su}\left\{\kappa_{rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsu}\right\} + \sum_{R,s,u} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{su}\left\{\kappa_{Rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{Rsu}\right\} \\
&+ \sum_{r,S,u} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{Su}\left\{\kappa_{rS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSu}\right\} + \sum_{r,s,U} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{sU}\left\{\kappa_{rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsU}\right\} \\
&+ \sum_{R,S,u} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{Su}\left\{\kappa_{RS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSu}\right\} + \sum_{R,s,U} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{sU}\left\{\kappa_{Rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RsU}\right\} \\
&+ \sum_{r,S,U} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{SU}\left\{\kappa_{rS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSU}\right\} + \sum_{R,S,U} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{SU}\left\{\kappa_{RS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSU}\right\} \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

From (7) we note that the entries of the matrix $W_{\beta\theta}$ are not all zero, which makes the derivation cumbersome, since all terms in (8) must be considered. These terms together with the cumulants needed to obtain them are given in the Appendix. After some tedious algebra, we arrive at the following expression, in matrix form, for the second order bias of $\hat{\beta}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
B(\hat{\beta}) &= K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T\left[M_1 P_{\beta\beta} + (M_2 + M_3)P_{\beta\theta} + M_5 P_{\theta\theta}\right] + K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T\left[N_2 G - N_1 F\right] \\
&+ K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T\left[M_2 P_{\beta\beta} + (M_4 + M_5)P_{\beta\theta} + M_6 P_{\theta\theta}\right] + K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T\left[N_2 F - N_3 G\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where M_1 to M_6 and N_1 to N_3 are given in (20)-(28) in the Appendix, $K^{\beta\beta}$, $K^{\beta\theta}$ and $K^{\theta\theta}$ are the matrices formed by the (r,s)th, (r,S)th and (R,S)th elements of the inverse of the Fisher's information matrix with $r,s = 1,\ldots,k$, $R,S = k+1,\ldots,k+h$, respectively, $P_{\beta\beta}$, $P_{\beta\theta}$ and $P_{\theta\theta}$ are the $n \times 1$ dimensional vectors containing the diagonal elements of $\tilde{X}K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T$, $\tilde{X}K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T$ and $\tilde{Z}K^{\theta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T$, respectively, $F = \mathrm{diag}(F_1,\ldots,F_n)\mathbf{1}$, $F_i = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}_i K^{\beta\beta})$, $\tilde{X}_i$ is a $k \times k$ matrix with elements $\partial^2\eta_{1i}/\partial\beta_r\beta_s$, $\mathbf{1}$ is an $n \times 1$ vector of ones, $G = \mathrm{diag}(G_1,\ldots,G_n)\mathbf{1}$, $G_i = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{Z}_i K^{\theta\theta})$, $\tilde{Z}_i$ is a $h \times h$ matrix with elements $\partial^2\eta_{2i}/\partial\theta_R\partial\theta_S$.

We define the $2n \times 1$-vectors ω_1 and ω_2 as

$$\omega_1 = \begin{pmatrix} M_1P_{\beta\beta} + (M_2+M_3)P_{\beta\theta} + M_5P_{\theta\theta} \\ M_2P_{\beta\beta} + (M_4+M_5)P_{\beta\theta} + M_6P_{\theta\theta} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\omega_2 = \begin{pmatrix} N_2G - N_1F \\ N_2F - N_3G \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also consider the $k \times (k+h)$ upper block of the matrix $K(\zeta)^{-1}$ given by

$$K^{\beta *} = \left(K^{\beta\beta}K^{\beta\theta}\right).$$

The $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\beta}$ can now be written as

$$B(\hat{\beta}) = K^{\beta *}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2). \tag{9}$$

We now turn to the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\theta}$. Analogously, we have the following expression, in matrix form, for the second order bias of $\hat{\theta}$:

$$\begin{aligned} B(\hat{\theta}) &= K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{X}^T\left[M_1P_{\beta\beta} + (M_2+M_3)P_{\beta\theta} + M_5P_{\theta\theta}\right] + K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{X}^T\left[N_2G - N_1F\right] \\ &+ K^{\theta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T\left[M_2P_{\beta\beta} + (M_4+M_5)P_{\beta\theta} + M_6P_{\theta\theta}\right] + K^{\theta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T\left[N_2F - N_3G\right], \end{aligned}$$

Then, considering the $h \times (k+h)$ lower block of the matrix $K(\zeta)^{-1}$, given by

$$K^{\theta *} = \left(K^{\beta\theta}K^{\theta\theta}\right),$$

we can write the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\theta}$ as

$$B(\hat{\theta}) = K^{\theta *}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2). \tag{10}$$

Thus, combining (9) and (10), we are able to find that the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the MLE of the joint vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \theta^T)^T$ can be written, in matrix form, as

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = K(\zeta)^{-1}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2) = (P^TWP)^{-1}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2).$$

Now, let $\xi_1 = W^{-1}\omega_1$ and $\xi_2 = W^{-1}\omega_2$, then, the previous expression becomes

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = \left(P^TWP\right)^{-1}P^TW(\xi_1 + \xi_2). \tag{11}$$

Thus, the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\zeta}$ (11) is easily obtained as the vector of regression coefficients in the formal weighted linear regression of $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$ on the columns of P with W as weight matrix.

The $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias (11) is expressed as the sum of two quantities: (i) $B_1 = \left(P^TWP\right)^{-1}P^TW\xi_1$, the bias for a linear beta regression model with dispersion covariates with model matrices $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Z}$, and thus generalizes the expression obtained by Ospina et al. (2006), and (ii) an additional quantity $B_2 = \left(P^TWP\right)^{-1}P^TW\xi_2$ due to the nonlinearity of the functions $f_1(x_i;\beta)$ and $f_2(z_i;\theta)$, and which vanishes if both f_1 and f_2 are linear in β and θ, respectively.

Now we can define our first bias-corrected estimator $\tilde{\zeta}$ as

$$\tilde{\zeta} = \hat{\zeta} - \hat{B}(\hat{\zeta}),$$

where $\hat{B}(\hat{\zeta})$ denotes the MLE of $B(\hat{\zeta})$, that is, the unknown parameters are replaced by their MLEs. Since the bias $B(\hat{\zeta})$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, it is not difficult to show that the asymptotic normality $\sqrt{n}\left(\tilde{\zeta} - \zeta\right) \xrightarrow{d}$

$N_{k+h}(0, J^{-1}(\zeta))$ still holds, where, as before, we assume that $J(\zeta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} K(\zeta)/n$ exists and is nonsingular. From the asymptotic normality of $\tilde{\zeta}$, we have that $\tilde{\zeta}_a \pm q_{1-\alpha/2}\left\{K(\tilde{\zeta})^{aa}\right\}^{1/2}$, for $a = 1, \ldots, k, k+1, \ldots, k+h$. The asymptotic variance of $\tilde{\zeta}_a$ is estimated by $K(\tilde{\zeta})^{aa}$, where $K(\tilde{\zeta})^{aa}$ is the ath diagonal element of the inverse of the Fisher's information matrix evaluated at $\tilde{\zeta}$.

We now turn to the bias-correction approach developed by Firth (1993) called the "preventive" method. This method also remove the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias and consists of modifying the original score function:

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + K(\zeta)B(\zeta),$$

where $K(\zeta)$ is the information matrix and $B(\zeta)$ is the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias. The solution $\check{\zeta}$ of $U^* = 0$ is a bias-corrected estimator, to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, for ζ. For our general class of beta regression models, the substitution of $B(\zeta)$ by (11) yields the following form for the modified score function:

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2). \tag{12}$$

The estimator $\check{\zeta}$, obtained as the root of the modified score function in (12), is consistent and asymptotically normal: $\sqrt{n}\left(\check{\zeta} - \zeta\right) \xrightarrow{d} N_{k+h}(0, J^{-1}(\zeta))$, with $J(\zeta)$ as given before. We also have that $\check{\zeta}_a \pm q_{1-\alpha/2}\left\{K(\check{\zeta})^{aa}\right\}^{1/2}$, for $a = 1, \ldots, k, k+1, \ldots, k+h$. The asymptotic variance of $\check{\zeta}_a$ is estimated by $K(\check{\zeta})^{aa}$, where $K(\check{\zeta})^{aa}$ is the ath diagonal element of the inverse of the Fisher's information matrix evaluated at $\check{\zeta}$.

A third, and the last approach we consider here, to bias-correcting MLEs of the regression parameters is based upon the numerical estimation of the bias through the bootstrap resampling scheme introduced by Efron (1979). Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\top$ be a random sample of size n, where each element is a random draw from the random variable Y which has the distribution function $F = F(\zeta)$. Here, ζ is the parameter that indexes the distribution, and is viewed as a functional of F, i.e., $\zeta = t(F)$. Finally, let $\hat{\zeta}$ be an estimator of ζ based on $\mathbf{y}$; we write $\hat{\zeta} = s(\mathbf{y})$.

The application of the bootstrap method consists in obtaining, from the original sample $\mathbf{y}$, a large number of pseudo-samples $\mathbf{y}^* = (y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^*)^\top$, and then extracting information from these samples to improve inference. Bootstrap methods can be classified into two classes, depending on how the sampling is performed: parametric and nonparametric. In the parametric version, the bootstrap samples are obtained from $F(\hat{\zeta})$, which we shall denote as $F_{\hat{\zeta}}$, whereas in the nonparametric version they are obtained from the empirical distribution function $\hat{F}$, through sampling with replacement. Note that the nonparametric bootstrap does not entail parametric assumptions.

Let $B_F(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta)$ be the bias of the estimator $\hat{\zeta} = s(\mathbf{y})$, that is,

$$B_F(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = \mathrm{E}_F[\hat{\zeta} - \zeta] = \mathrm{E}_F[s(\mathbf{y})] - t(F),$$

where the subscript F indicates that expectation is taken with respect to F. The bootstrap estimators of the bias in the parametric and nonparametric versions are obtained by replacing the true distribution F, which generated the original sample, with $F_{\hat{\zeta}}$ and $\hat{F}$, respectively, in the above expression. Therefore, the parametric and nonparametric estimates of the bias are given, respectively, by

$$B_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = \mathrm{E}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}[s(\mathbf{y})] - t(F_{\hat{\zeta}}) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = \mathrm{E}_{\hat{F}}[s(\mathbf{y})] - t(\hat{F}).$$

If B bootstrap samples $(\mathbf{y}^{*1}, \mathbf{y}^{*2}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}^{*B})$ are generated independently from the original sample $\mathbf{y}$, and the respective boostrap replications $(\hat{\zeta}^{*1}, \hat{\zeta}^{*2}, \ldots, \hat{\zeta}^{*B})$ are calculated, where $\hat{\zeta}^{*b} = s(\mathbf{y}^{*b})$, $b = 1, 2, \ldots, B$, then it is possible to approximate the bootstrap expectations $\mathrm{E}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}[s(\mathbf{y})]$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\hat{F}}[s(\mathbf{y})]$ by the mean $\hat{\zeta}^{*(\cdot)} = \frac{1}{B}\sum_{b=1}^{B}\hat{\zeta}^{*b}$. Therefore, the bootstrap bias estimates based on B replications of $\hat{\zeta}$ are

$$\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = \hat{\zeta}^{*(\cdot)} - s(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = \hat{\zeta}^{*(\cdot)} - s(\mathbf{y}), \tag{13}$$

for the parametric and nonparametric versions, respectively.

By using the two bootstrap bias estimates presented above, we arrive at the following two bias-corrected, to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, estimators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\zeta}_1 &= s(\mathbf{y}) - \hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = 2\hat{\zeta} - \hat{\zeta}^{*(\cdot)}, \\
\overline{\zeta}_2 &= s(\mathbf{y}) - \hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta) = 2\hat{\zeta} - \hat{\zeta}^{*(\cdot)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The corrected estimates $\overline{\zeta}_1$ and $\overline{\zeta}_2$ were called constant-bias-correcting (CBC) estimates by MacKinnon and Smith (1998).

Since we are dealing with regression models and not with a random sample we need some minor modifications to the algorithm given above.

For the nonparametric case, assume we want to fit a regression model with response variable y and predictors $x_1, \ldots, x_{q_1}, z_1, \ldots, z_{q_2}$. We have a sample of n observations $p_i^T = (y_i, x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{iq_1}, z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{iq_2})$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus we use the nonparametric bootstrap method described above to obtain B bootstrap samples of the p_i^T, fit the model and save the coefficients from each bootstrap sample. We can then obtain bias corrected estimates for the regression coefficients using the methods described above. This is the so-called Random-x resampling.

For the parametric case, assume we have the same model as for the nonparametric case, we thus obtain the estimates $\hat{\mu}_i$ and $\hat{\phi}_i$ (such as in our case where the distribution is indexed by μ and ϕ) and using the parametric method described above, we obtain B bootstrap samples for $\hat{y}_i$ from the distribution $F(\hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\phi}_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We would then regress each set of bootstrapped values y_b^* on the covariates $x_1, \ldots, x_{q_1}, z_1, \ldots, z_{q_2}$ to obtain bootstrap replications of the regression coefficients. We can, again, obtain bias corrected estimates for the regression coefficients using the methods described above. This method is called Fixed-x resampling.

4 Bias correction of the MLEs of μ and ϕ

In this Section we obtain the results that are the most valuable to the practioners, namely, the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of μ and of ϕ, since, for practioners, the interest in a data analysis relies on sharp estimates of the responses and of the precision parameters. The fact that these results must be computed apart comes from the fact that if $\ddot{\beta}$ and $\ddot{\theta}$ are bias-free estimators, to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, it is not true, in general, that $\ddot{\mu}_i = g_1^{-1}(f_1(x_i; \ddot{\beta}))$ and $\ddot{\phi}_i = g_2^{-1}(f_2(z_i; \ddot{\theta}))$ will also be bias-free to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$. Nevertheless, for practioners, it is even more important to correct the means of the responses and the precision parameters than correcting the regression parameters. Moreover, the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of $\hat{\mu}$ for the linear beta regression model was not presented in Ospina et al. (2006).

We shall first obtain the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the MLEs of η_1 and η_2. Using (3) we find, by Taylor expansion, that to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$:

$$f_1(x_i^T; \hat{\beta}) - f_1(x_i^T; \beta) = \nabla_\beta(\eta_{1i})^T(\hat{\beta} - \beta) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^T \tilde{X}_i(\hat{\beta} - \beta),$$

and

$$f_2(z_i^T; \hat{\theta}) - f_2(z_i^T; \theta) = \nabla_\theta(\eta_{2i})^T(\hat{\theta} - \theta) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^T \tilde{Z}_i(\hat{\theta} - \theta),$$

where $\nabla_\beta(\eta_{1i})$ is a $k \times 1$ vector with the derivatives $\partial\eta_{1i}/\partial\beta_r$, $\nabla_\theta(\eta_{2i})$ is a $h \times 1$ vector with the derivatives $\partial\eta_{2i}/\partial\theta_R$, and all the other quantities were previously defined in page 6.

Thus, taking expectations on both sides of the above expression yields to this order

$$B(\hat{\eta_1}) = \tilde{X}B(\hat{\beta}) + \frac{1}{2}F,$$

and

$$B(\hat{\eta_2}) = \tilde{Z}B(\hat{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2}G,$$

where, F and G were defined in page 6, and since $K^{\beta\beta}$ and $K^{\theta\theta}$ are the asymptotic covariance matrices of $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\theta}$, respectively.

From similar calculations we obtain to order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$

$$B(\hat{\mu}_i) = B(\hat{\eta}_{1i})\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\eta_{1i}})\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}$$

and

$$B(\hat{\phi}_i) = B(\hat{\eta}_{2i})\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\eta_{2i}})\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}.$$

Let T_1 and T_2 be as in page 4, further, let $S_1 = \text{diag}(d^2\mu_i/d\eta_{1i}^2)$ and $S_2 = \text{diag}(d^2\phi_i/d\eta_{2i}^2)$. Then, we can write the above expressions in matrix notation as

$$B(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2}T_1(2\tilde{X}B(\hat{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2}S_1P_{\beta\beta} \tag{14}$$

and

$$B(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{1}{2}T_2(2\tilde{Z}B(\hat{\theta}) + G) + \frac{1}{2}S_2P_{\theta\theta}, \tag{15}$$

where $P_{\beta\beta}$ and $P_{\theta\theta}$ were defined in page 6 and since the asymptotic covariance matrices of $\hat{\eta}_1$ and $\hat{\eta}_2$ are $\tilde{X}K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T$ and $\tilde{Z}K^{\theta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T$, respectively.

If we combine (14) and (15) with (9) and (10), we will have the following explicit expressions for the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$, respectively:

$$B_1(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2}T_1(2\tilde{X}K^{\beta *}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2) + F) + \frac{1}{2}S_1P_{\beta\beta}$$

and

$$B_1(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{1}{2}T_2(2\tilde{Z}K^{\theta *}P^T(\omega_1 + \omega_2) + G) + \frac{1}{2}S_2P_{\theta\theta}.$$

Further, let $\check{\beta}$ and $\check{\phi}$ be the estimators obtained as the root of the modified score function (12). Then we also obtain the following formulae for the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$, respectively:

$$B_2(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2}T_1(2\tilde{X}(\hat{\beta} - \check{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2}S_1P_{\beta\beta}$$

and

$$B_2(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{1}{2}T_2(2\tilde{Z}(\hat{\theta} - \check{\theta}) + G) + \frac{1}{2}S_2P_{\theta\theta}.$$

Lastly, we can use the bootstrap-based $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases to define, bias corrected estimators of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ to this order. Then, let $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\beta})$ be the vector formed by the first k elements of the vector $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta)$ defined in equation (13), $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\theta})$ be the vector formed by the last h elements of the vector $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta)$, and define $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\beta})$ and $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\theta})$ analogously from the vector $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta)$ also in equation (13). Thus, we have the following alternative expressions for the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$, respectively:

$$B_3(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2}T_1(2\tilde{X}\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2}S_1P_{\beta\beta} \text{ and } B_4(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2}T_1(2\tilde{X}\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2}S_1P_{\beta\beta},$$

and

$$B_3(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{1}{2}T_2(2\tilde{Z}\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\zeta}}}(\hat{\theta}) + G) + \frac{1}{2}S_2P_{\theta\theta} \text{ and } B_4(\hat{\phi}) = \frac{1}{2}T_2(2\tilde{Z}\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\theta}) + G) + \frac{1}{2}S_2P_{\theta\theta}.$$

Therefore, we are now able to define the following second-order bias-corrected estimators for $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$:

$$\tilde{\mu} = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_1(\hat{\mu}), \quad \check{\mu} = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_2(\hat{\mu}), \quad \overline{\mu}_1 = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_3(\hat{\mu}) \text{ and } \overline{\mu}_2 = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_4(\hat{\mu})$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi} = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_1(\hat{\phi}), \quad \check{\phi} = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_2(\hat{\phi}), \quad \overline{\phi}_1 = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_3(\hat{\phi}) \text{ and } \overline{\phi}_2 = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_4(\hat{\phi}),$$

where, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, $\hat{B}_j(\cdot)$ denotes the MLE of $B_j(\cdot)$, that is, the unknown parameters are replaced by their MLEs. Finally, one can also use bootstrap techniques to obtain directly the biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$, therefore, denote by $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi}}}(\hat{\mu})$ the vector of $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ parametric bootstrap biases for $\hat{\mu}$, and by $\hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi}}}(\hat{\phi})$ the vector of $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ parametric bootstrap biases for $\hat{\phi}$ defined in equation (13). Further, define $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\mu})$ and $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\phi})$ analogously from the vector $\hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\zeta}, \zeta)$ also in equation (13). Hence, we can also define the following bias-corrected estimators of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$:

$$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_1 = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi}}}(\hat{\mu}) \text{ and } \overline{\overline{\mu}}_2 = \hat{\mu} - \hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\mu}),$$

and

$$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_1 = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_{F_{\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi}}}(\hat{\phi}) \text{ and } \overline{\overline{\phi}}_2 = \hat{\phi} - \hat{B}_{\hat{F}}(\hat{\phi}).$$

We give in Tables 1 and 2 the most common link functions for g_1 and g_2, respectively, together with their first and second derivatives. We believe this will help the practioners that may be interested in applying our results. For Table 1 $\Phi(\cdot)$ denotes the standard normal distribution function, $f(x) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi}\exp\{-1/2x^2\}$ is the density of a standard normal distribution and $f'(x) = -x/\sqrt{2\pi}\exp\{-1/2x^2\}$ is the derivative of the density of a standard normal distribution.

Table 1: Values of $d\mu/d\eta_1$, $d^2\mu/d\eta_1^2$ for the most common link functions.

Link function	Formula	$d\mu/d\eta_1$
Logit	$\log(\mu/(1-\mu)) = \eta_1$	$\mu(1-\mu)$
Probit	$\Phi^{-1}(\mu) = \eta_1$	$f(\Phi^{-1}(\mu))$
Comp. Log-Log	$\log(-\log(1-\mu)) = \eta_1$	$-\log(1-\mu)/(1-\mu)$
Link function	Formula	$d^2\mu/d\eta_1^2$
Logit	$\log(\mu/(1-\mu)) = \eta_1$	$\mu(1-\mu)(1-2\mu)$
Probit	$\Phi^{-1}(\mu) = \eta_1$	$f'(\Phi^{-1}(\mu))$
Comp. Log-Log	$\log(-\log(1-\mu)) = \eta_1$	$-(1-\mu)\log(1-\mu)(1+\log(1-\mu))$

Table 2: Values of $d\phi/d\eta_2$, $d^2\phi/d\eta_2^2$ for the most common link functions.

Link function	Formula	$d\phi/d\eta_2$	$d^2\phi/d\eta_2^2$
Identity	$\phi = \eta_2$	1	0
Log	$\log(\phi) = \eta_2$	ϕ	ϕ
Square root	$\sqrt{\phi} = \eta_2$	2ϕ	2

5 Some special cases

In this section we consider some special models that commonly arise in the practical use, namely, the linear beta regression model, the linear beta regression model with dispersion covariates, the nonlinear beta regression model and the nonlinear beta regression model with linear dispersion covariates. Further, we study these models in full detail, that is, we give closed form expressions for their score vector, Fisher's information matrix and for the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ biases of the MLEs of β, θ, μ and ϕ.

5.1 The linear beta regression model

For linear beta regression models we have, in (3), $g_1(\mu_i) = g(\mu_i)$, where $g(\cdot)$ is some link function, $g_2(\phi_i) = \phi_i$, and further, we can write (3) as

$$g(\mu_i) = \eta_i = x_i^T\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_i = \phi,$$

where $\phi > 0$ is a constant, i.e., we have that in this case $\tilde{X} = X$ and $\tilde{Z} = \mathbf{1}$, where X is the matrix of covariates with rows given by x_i^T, and the parameters $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\phi \in (0, \infty)$. Furthermore, the score vector (5) becomes

$$\begin{array}{rcl} U_\beta(\beta,\phi) & = & \phi X^T T(y^* - \mu^*), \\ U_\phi(\beta,\phi) & = & \sum_{i=1}^n v_i, \end{array} \tag{16}$$

where $T = \text{diag}(d\mu_i/d\eta_i)$ and y^*, μ^*, and v_i are defined in page 4. Moreover, the matrices P and W defined by equations (6) and (7) becomes, respectively,

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} W_{\beta\beta} & W_{\beta\phi} \\ W_{\beta\phi} & W_{\phi\phi}, \end{pmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

with

$$W_{\beta\beta} = \text{diag}\left(\phi^2 a_i \left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_i}\right)^2\right),$$

$$W_{\beta\phi} = \text{diag}\left(\phi\{\mu_i a_i - \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi)\}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_i}\right)\right),$$

$$W_{\phi\phi} = \text{diag}(b_i).$$

Here, a_i and b_i are as defined in page 4. Therefore, we have the following expression for the Fisher's information matrix for the parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \phi)^T$

$$K(\zeta) = P^T W P. \tag{18}$$

By means of simple calculations it is possible to conclude that equations (16) and (18) agree with the expressions for the score vector and Fisher's information matrix given in Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004).

We now move to the bias correction. Note initially that ξ_2 given in (11) vanishes since, for this model, both η_1 and η_2 are linear functions of β and θ, respectively. Thus, if P and W are the matrices defined for this model, equation (11) equals simply

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = (P^T W P)^{-1} P^T W \xi_1,$$

which is easy to see that agrees with the finds of Ospina et al. (2006). Further, ω_2 in equation (12) also vanishes which gives us the expression

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + P^T \omega_1,$$

and it is also easy to see that it agrees with the finds of Ospina et al. (2006). Finally, following equation (14), the second order bias of $\hat{\mu}$ can be expressed, in matrix notation, as

$$B(\hat{\mu}) = TXB(\hat{\beta}) + \frac{1}{2} S_1 P_{\beta\beta},$$

with T defined in the begining of this subsection and S_1 was defined in page 9.

5.2 The linear beta regression model with dispersion covariates

This class of models generalizes the linear beta regression models considered in the last subsection by letting the precision parameter ϕ vary through a linear regression structure. More precisely, for this model the equation (3) becomes

$$g_1(\mu_i) = \eta_{1i} = x_i^T \beta \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(\phi_i) = \eta_{2i} = z_i^T \theta,$$

where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^h$. Then, we have that for this model $\tilde{X} = X$ and $\tilde{Z} = Z$, where X is the matrix of covariates with rows given by x_i^T and Z is the matrix of covariates with rows given by z_i^T. The score vector for this model is identical to the one given in expression (5), only that in this case $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Z}$ must be replaced by X and Z, respectively.

Now, the matrix P defined in (6) becomes for this model

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{pmatrix},$$

further, let W be the matriz defined in (7), thus, we have the following expression for the Fisher's information matrix for the parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \theta)^T$

$$K(\zeta) = P^T W P.$$

Moving to bias correction, since both η_1 and η_2 are linear functions of β and θ, respectively, we have that ξ_2 in equation (11) vanishes and thus the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias of the MLEs of the parameter vector ζ is

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = (P^T W P)^{-1} P^T W \xi_1.$$

Further, since ω_2 in (12) vanishes, the modified score to obtain the estimator through the preventive method is given by

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + P^T \omega_1,$$

and, finally, using equations (14) and (15), the second order biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ are given by

$$B(\hat{\mu}) = T_1 X B(\hat{\beta}) + \frac{1}{2} S_1 P_{\beta\beta},$$

and

$$B(\hat{\phi}) = T_2 Z B(\hat{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} S_2 P_{\theta\theta},$$

where T_1 and T_2 were defined in page 4, S_1 and S_2 were defined in page 9, $P_{\beta\beta}$ and $P_{\theta\theta}$ were defined in page 6.

5.3 The nonlinear beta regression model

We now consider the nonlinear beta regression models. For this models, the expressions in (3) turns to be $g_1(\mu_i) = g(\mu_i)$, where $g(\cdot)$ is some link function, $g_2(\phi_i) = \phi_i$, and further, we can write (3) as

$$g(\mu_i) = \eta_i = f(x_i^T; \beta) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_i = \phi,$$

where $\phi > 0$ is a constant, i.e., and thus, in this case $\tilde{X}$ remains the same and $\tilde{Z} = \mathbf{1}$, the parameters $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\phi \in (0, \infty)$. Furthermore, the score vector (5) becomes

$$\begin{array}{rcl} U_\beta(\beta, \phi) & = & \phi \tilde{X}^T T (y^* - \mu^*), \\ U_\phi(\beta, \phi) & = & \sum_{i=1}^n v_i, \end{array}$$

where T is as defined in equation (16), and v_i are defined in page 4. Moreover, the matrix P defined by equation (6), becomes

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and the matrix W defined by equation (7) is actually the same as the matrix given in equation (17). Therefore, the Fisher's information matrix for the parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \phi)^T$ can also be written as $K(\zeta) = P^T W P$.

We now turn to bias correction. For this model, the vector ξ_2 in equation (11) can be written as $\xi_2 = W^{-1} \tilde{\omega}_2$, where $\tilde{\omega}_2$ is given below:

$$\tilde{\omega}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -N_1 F \\ N_2 F \end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

where N_1 and N_2 are given in equations (26) and (27) of Appendix, and F is given in page 6. Thus, using P, W and ξ_2 defined in this Subsection, the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias for the MLEs of the parameter vector ζ is given by

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = (P^T W P)^{-1} P^T W (\xi_1 + \xi_2),$$

ξ_1 being as defined in formula (11). Further, the modified score to obtain the estimator through the preventive method is given by

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + P^T (\omega_1 + \tilde{\omega}_2).$$

Moreover, the second order bias of $\hat{\mu}$ can be written, following equation (14), as

$$B(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} T (2 \tilde{X} B(\hat{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2} S_1 P_{\beta\beta},$$

with S_1 as defined in page 9.

5.4 The nonlinear beta regression model with linear dispersion covariates

This class of models generalizes the nonlinear beta regression models considered in the last subsection by letting the precision parameter ϕ vary through a linear regression structure, such as the linear beta regression with dispersion covariates generalizes the linear beta regression. More precisely, for this model the equation (3) becomes

$$g_1(\mu_i) = \eta_{1i} = f(x_i^T; \beta) \text{ and } g_2(\phi_i) = \eta_{2i} = z_i^T \theta,$$

where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^h$. Then, we have that for this model $\tilde{X}$ remaining the same, and $\tilde{Z} = Z$, where Z is the matrix of covariates with rows given by z_i^T. The score vector for this model is identical to the one given in expression (5), only that, in this case $\tilde{Z}$ must be replaced by Z.

Now, the matrix P defined in (6) becomes for this model

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X} & 0 \\ 0 & Z \end{pmatrix},$$

further, let W be the matriz defined in (7), thus, we have the following expression for the Fisher's information matrix for the parameter vector $\zeta = (\beta^T, \theta)^T$

$$K(\zeta) = P^T W P.$$

Moving to bias correction, for this model the vector ξ_2 in equation (11) can be written as $\xi_2 = W^{-1}\tilde{\omega}_2$, where $\tilde{\omega}_2$ was defined in equation (19). Thus, using P and ξ_2 defined in this Subsection, the $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ bias for the MLEs of the parameter vector ζ is given by

$$B(\hat{\zeta}) = (P^T W P)^{-1} P^T W (\xi_1 + \xi_2),$$

ξ_1 being as defined in formula (11). Further, the modified score to obtain the estimator through the preventive method is given by

$$U^*(\zeta) = U(\zeta) + P^T(\omega_1 + \tilde{\omega}_2).$$

Moreover, the second order biases of $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ can be written, following equation (14), respectively, as

$$B(\hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} T_1 (2\tilde{X} B(\hat{\beta}) + F) + \frac{1}{2} S_1 P_{\beta\beta},$$

and

$$B(\hat{\phi}) = T_2 Z B(\hat{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} S_2 P_{\theta\theta},$$

with T_1 and T_2 as defined in page 4, and, S_1 and S_2 as defined in page 9.

6 Numerical results

In this section we present the results of some Monte Carlo simulation experiments, where we study the finite-sample distributions of the MLEs of β and θ along with their corrected versions proposed in this paper. The first experiment uses a logit link in a nonlinear model for the regression parameters and a log link in a nonlinear model for the precision parameter

$$\text{logit}\mu_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1,i} + x_{2,i}^{\beta_2},$$

$$\log\phi_i = \theta_0 + \theta_1 x_{1,i} + x_{2,i}^{\theta_2}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where the true values of the parameters were taken as $\beta_0 = 1.5$, $\beta_1 = 0.5$ and $\beta_2 = 2$; and $\theta_0 = 1.7, \theta_1 = 0.7$ and $\theta_2 = 3$. Note also that here the elements of the $n \times 3$ matrix $\tilde{X}$ are: $\tilde{X}(\beta)_{i,1} = 1; \tilde{X}(\beta)_{i,2} = x_{1,i}$, and $\tilde{X}(\beta)_{i,3} = \log(x_{2,i}) x_{2,i}^{\beta_2}$. The explanatory variables x_1 and x_2 were generated from the standard normal and uniform $\text{U}(1, 2)$ distributions, respectively, for $n = 20, 40$ and 60. The values of x_1 and x_2 were held constant throughout the simulations. The total number of Monte Carlo replications was set at $5,000$ for each sample size. All simulations were performed using the software `Ox`.

Table 3: Simulation results for $n = 20$.

Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
β_0	1.5147	1.5032	1.5253	1.5019	1.5061
Bias	0.0147	0.0032	0.0253	0.0019	0.0061
Variance	0.0628	0.0627	0.0667	0.0627	0.0677
MSE	0.0630	0.0627	0.0674	0.0627	0.0677
β_1	0.5001	0.5001	0.5002	0.5005	0.5017
Bias	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0005	0.0017
Variance	0.0126	0.0126	0.0132	0.0125	0.0143
MSE	0.0126	0.0126	0.0132	0.0125	0.0143
β_2	1.9905	1.9968	1.9847	1.9982	2.0036
Bias	-0.0095	-0.0032	-0.0153	-0.0018	0.0036
Variance	0.0119	0.0118	0.0129	0.0117	0.0125
MSE	0.0120	0.0118	0.0130	0.0117	0.0125
θ_0	1.9512	1.7406	2.1388	1.7045	1.8107
Bias	0.2512	0.0406	0.4388	0.0045	0.1107
Variance	0.5615	0.5100	0.6248	0.4833	0.4739
MSE	0.6247	0.5116	0.8173	0.4833	0.4861
θ_1	0.7091	0.6928	0.7331	0.6842	0.7060
Bias	0.0091	-0.0072	0.0331	-0.1584	0.0060
Variance	0.2881	0.2481	0.3651	0.2231	0.2369
MSE	0.2882	0.2481	0.3662	0.2234	0.2369
θ_2	3.0261	3.0061	3.0440	3.0043	3.0757
Bias	0.0261	0.0061	0.0440	0.0043	0.0757
Variance	0.0706	0.0610	0.0805	0.0514	0.0471
MSE	0.0720	0.0611	0.0825	0.0514	0.0528

In each of the $5,000$ replications, we fitted the model and computed the MLEs $\hat{\beta}$, $\hat{\theta}$, its corrected versions from the corrective method (Cox and Snell, 1968), preventive method (Firth, 1993) and the bootstrap method both of its parametric and nonparametric versions (Efron, 1979). The number of bootstrap replications was set to 600 for both bootstrap methods.

In order to analyze the results we computed, for each sample size and for each estimator, the mean of estimates, bias, variance and mean square error (MSE). Tables 3-15 present simulation results for sample sizes $n = 20, 40$ and 60, respectively. Moreover, we also considered the estimated values of μ_i and ϕ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $n = 20, 40$ and 60, along with its corrected estimators presented in Section 4. We also want to emphasize that, for the bootstrap schemes, two methods to removing the first-order bias can be considered: the one induced by the Taylor's expansion and the one given by the bootstrap itself, denoted by $\overline{\alpha}_i$ and $\overline{\overline{\alpha}}_i$, respectively, where α_i is a surrogate for μ_i and ϕ_i.

Table 3 presents simulation results for sample size $n = 20$ with respect to the parameters β and θ. We begin by looking the estimated biases, in absolute value, of the estimators. Initially we note that for all parameters the biases of the corrective estimators were smaller than of the original MLEs. However, for all parameters the biases of preventive estimators were bigger than of the original MLEs, moreover, not only the biases were bigger but also the MSE, which shows that the preventive method does not work well for this model, the same phenomenon occurred in Ospina et al. (2006), which collaborates to the idea that this method has some problems in beta regression models. We now observe that the MSE of the corrective estimators were smaller than those of the MLEs for all parameters, showing that the correction is effective. Moving to the bootstrap corrected-estimators we note that the parametric bootstrap had the smallest MSE for all parameters, even though the biases were not the smallest. However, the MSE were

Table 4: Estimated values of μ for $n = 20$.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		p-boot		np-boot		np-boot	
	$\hat{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\tilde{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$
1	0.99576	0.0108	0.99576	0.0108	0.99577	0.0107	0.99577	0.0107	0.99581	0.0128	0.99585	0.0122
2	0.99355	0.2276	0.99361	0.2221	0.99364	0.2203	0.99361	0.2223	0.99401	0.2616	0.99369	0.2571
3	0.95051	0.0001	0.95069	1.0474	0.95081	1.0440	0.95065	1.0492	0.95252	1.1269	0.95092	1.1430
4	0.98047	0.7630	0.98049	0.7620	0.98051	0.7594	0.98050	0.7616	0.98084	0.8367	0.98070	0.8373
5	0.95597	7.5592	0.95612	7.5248	0.95621	7.4940	0.95609	7.5313	0.95755	8.1211	0.95635	8.2285
6	0.99447	0.0152	0.99447	0.0152	0.99447	0.0152	0.99448	0.0151	0.99451	0.0168	0.99458	0.0169
7	0.97837	1.1784	0.97838	1.1761	0.97842	1.1737	0.97838	1.1783	0.97897	1.2768	0.97858	1.2786
8	0.99383	0.0126	0.99383	0.0126	0.99383	0.0126	0.99384	0.0126	0.99387	0.0143	0.99394	0.0146
9	0.99537	0.0117	0.99537	0.0117	0.99537	0.0117	0.99538	0.0116	0.99542	0.0133	0.99547	0.0129
10	0.98111	1.1470	0.98116	1.1389	0.98120	1.1357	0.98116	1.1418	0.98183	1.2585	0.98133	1.2525
11	0.99451	0.0115	0.99450	0.0115	0.99450	0.0115	0.99451	0.0114	0.99455	0.0134	0.99460	0.0134
12	0.99002	0.1023	0.99002	0.1022	0.99003	0.1020	0.99004	0.1020	0.99013	0.1126	0.99018	0.1133
13	0.97723	2.1492	0.97732	2.1264	0.97739	2.1185	0.97732	2.1327	0.97832	2.3582	0.97750	2.3507
14	0.99222	0.1662	0.99224	0.1646	0.99226	0.1640	0.99225	0.1648	0.99251	0.1888	0.99235	0.1856
15	0.99169	0.0522	0.99167	0.0523	0.99168	0.0523	0.99168	0.0523	0.99178	0.0590	0.99180	0.0586
16	0.96273	4.7219	0.96282	4.7072	0.96289	4.6905	0.96280	4.7116	0.96393	5.0719	0.96305	5.1305
17	0.97674	2.0972	0.97687	2.0702	0.97693	2.0568	0.97688	2.0675	0.97758	2.2964	0.97711	2.3020
18	0.95009	1.3879	0.95039	1.3752	0.95056	1.3703	0.95035	1.3794	0.95288	1.5040	0.95061	1.5142
19	0.94657	1.5431	0.94695	1.5243	0.94712	1.5146	0.94691	1.5251	0.94909	1.6708	0.94717	1.6917
20	0.92738	3.6923	0.92811	3.6351	0.92840	3.6103	0.92804	3.6378	0.93157	4.0065	0.92828	4.0608

Table 5: Estimated values of ϕ for $n = 20$.

i	True	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		np-boot	
	ϕ_i	$\hat{\phi}_i$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\tilde{\phi}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$
1	12218	32123	48311	12500	3516.6	8542.3	831.41	13848	21445
2	1512.2	4977.5	6716.2	1567.4	212.00	873.67	97.962	1991.9	809.20
3	33.710	55.534	0.0308	35.446	0.0082	33.122	0.0071	39.450	0.0138
4	381.74	652.63	3.5711	404.02	0.8616	374.10	0.6805	523.56	2.3280
5	49.260	81.864	0.0911	52.560	0.0236	49.382	0.0187	60.855	0.0544
6	8602.5	22211	19727	8858.7	1522.2	6182.9	308.90	9874.8	9677.1
7	168.67	267.63	0.4576	174.93	0.1307	163.20	0.1128	218.12	0.2947
8	5343.4	11400	2349.0	5613.7	34.533	4558.3	121.79	7036.3	843.28
9	12920	37410	90373	12865	4081.7	7660.0	2134.6	12609	58969
10	191.66	343.11	2.0051	203.41	0.4408	182.27	0.2683	248.99	0.7876
11	6293.7	13636	3631.7	6597.4	0.0518	5301.0	180.91	8269.6	1213.7
12	2235.6	4604.2	304.53	2362.9	50.021	2000.5	23.615	3035.0	124.77
13	122.77	237.92	1.5913	132.08	0.2858	114.87	0.1369	152.74	0.4410
14	1288.6	2744.5	306.24	1377.5	44.117	1142.9	15.643	1843.3	82.982
15	1706.1	2935.0	55.657	1767.5	13.164	1589.4	9.5611	2382.9	32.945
16	66.492	106.15	0.0928	69.929	0.0027	66.068	0.0234	83.020	0.0559
17	375.66	876.02	33.651	412.62	3.7010	351.16	3.1617	520.18	23.952
18	28.969	57.292	0.0949	30.760	0.0153	26.626	0.0068	30.897	0.0227
19	43.286	98.112	1.9018	50.435	0.1725	44.321	0.1744	57.730	2.6463
20	24.754	81.680	9.3312	30.351	0.1859	22.880	0.1946	39.086	15.773

Table 6: Simulation results for $n = 40$.

Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
β_0	1.5039	1.4991	1.5079	1.4962	1.4946
β_0	1.5039	1.4991	1.5079	1.4962	1.4946
Bias	0.0039	-0.0009	0.0079	-0.0038	-0.0054
Variance	0.0329	0.0330	0.0337	0.0329	0.0339
MSE	0.0329	0.0330	0.0338	0.0329	0.0339
β_1	0.5029	0.5028	0.5033	0.5030	0.5037
Bias	0.0029	0.0028	0.0033	0.0030	0.0037
Variance	0.0077	0.0077	0.0079	0.0077	0.0084
MSE	0.0077	0.0077	0.0079	0.0077	0.0084
β_2	1.9960	1.9993	1.9930	2.0014	2.0069
Bias	-0.0040	-0.0007	-0.0070	0.0014	0.0069
Variance	0.0146	0.0145	0.0151	0.0144	0.0150
MSE	0.0146	0.0145	0.0151	0.0144	0.0150
θ_0	1.7460	1.6884	1.7865	1.6972	1.7033
Bias	0.0460	-0.0116	0.0865	-0.0028	0.0033
Variance	0.1895	0.1755	0.2108	0.1708	0.1811
MSE	0.1916	0.1757	0.2183	0.1708	0.1811
θ_1	0.7264	0.7110	0.7480	0.7043	0.7021
Bias	0.0264	0.0110	0.0480	0.0043	0.0021
Variance	0.0744	0.0696	0.0816	0.0697	0.0727
MSE	0.0751	0.0698	0.0839	0.0697	0.0727
θ_2	3.0701	3.0220	3.1226	3.0067	3.0632
Bias	0.0701	0.0220	0.1226	0.0067	0.0632
Variance	0.0709	0.0652	0.0791	0.0597	0.0633
MSE	0.0758	0.0657	0.0941	0.0597	0.0673

very close to the MSE of the corrective method, and the computation of the parametric bootstrap biases is computer intensive, whereas the corrective method is not. Lastly, we observe that for all parameters θ the MSE of the nonparametric bootstrap corrected estimators were smaller than those of the MLEs. Moreover, for the parameters β, the MSE of the nonparametric bootstrap corrected estimators were very close to those of the MLEs, showing that this method is satisfactory, and is very easy to implement by practioners since no parametric assumptions are made. Therefore, for the small sample size $n = 20$, we were able to conclude that corrective method by Cox and Snell (1969) was successfully applied, as well as the bootstrap correction.

Table 4 presents the simulation results for sample size $n = 20$ with respect to the parameter μ. We did not consider the preventive estimators since its estimation was poor. The MSE of both nonparametric bootstrap correction schemes are the biggest ones for all parameters. The best estimators, with respect to MSE, are the parametric bootstrap schemes. Finally, the MSE of the corrective method are always least or equal those of the MLE. Note also that, for the for the means, all the values are not distant from each other. These results show that, even for small sample, we are able to obtain a satisfactory bias correction for both the corrective method and the parametric bootstrap method.

Table 5 presents the simulation results for sample size $n = 20$ with respect to the parameter ϕ. The bootstrap correction scheme based on Taylor's expasion is not presented in this Table, since its performance was worse than those of the regular bootstrap correction, for both parametric and nonparametric schemes. The first remarkable fact is that if the true value of ϕ is large, the bias of the corrective method is small when compared with the others estimators, and the bias of the parametric bootstrap

Table 7: Estimated values of μ for $n = 40$ for observations 1 until 20.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		p-boot		np-boot		np-boot	
	$\hat{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\tilde{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$
1	0.99163	0.0499	0.99162	0.0501	0.99162	0.0501	0.99163	0.0500	0.99167	0.0527	0.99170	0.0534
2	0.99236	0.1183	0.99238	0.1176	0.99239	0.1176	0.99238	0.1177	0.99246	0.1267	0.99242	0.1264
3	0.99225	0.0955	0.99226	0.0953	0.99226	0.0953	0.99227	0.0950	0.99232	0.1004	0.99234	0.1001
4	0.95825	3.3785	0.95839	3.3684	0.95836	3.3660	0.95833	3.3704	0.95854	3.5272	0.95841	3.5644
5	0.97837	0.5878	0.97839	0.5886	0.97838	0.5881	0.97838	0.5880	0.97846	0.6187	0.97849	0.6220
6	0.97923	0.3741	0.97923	0.3759	0.97921	0.3757	0.97921	0.3757	0.97927	0.3893	0.97931	0.3922
7	0.98064	0.2667	0.98062	0.2679	0.98060	0.2682	0.98061	0.2683	0.98065	0.2717	0.98068	0.2739
8	0.97723	0.4311	0.97722	0.4333	0.97720	0.4333	0.97720	0.4334	0.97725	0.4431	0.97729	0.4463
9	0.98934	0.1064	0.98933	0.1067	0.98933	0.1067	0.98934	0.1065	0.98938	0.1120	0.98942	0.1128
10	0.96028	3.9369	0.96049	3.9106	0.96045	3.9195	0.96040	3.9269	0.96064	4.0261	0.96040	4.0708
11	0.98530	0.1122	0.98528	0.1129	0.98527	0.1129	0.98527	0.1129	0.98531	0.1154	0.98536	0.1173
12	0.95741	3.4003	0.95755	3.3922	0.95751	3.3906	0.95749	3.3950	0.95769	3.5413	0.95755	3.5779
13	0.96244	3.7194	0.96266	3.6900	0.96261	3.6983	0.96257	3.7058	0.96282	3.8067	0.96257	3.8523
14	0.99558	0.0243	0.99558	0.0240	0.99558	0.0243	0.99559	0.0243	0.99563	0.0265	0.99563	0.0263
15	0.98461	0.1285	0.98459	0.1291	0.98457	0.1293	0.98458	0.1293	0.98461	0.1311	0.98465	0.1329
16	0.91254	2.1237	0.91303	2.1175	0.91290	2.1211	0.91280	2.1242	0.91332	2.1894	0.91266	2.2149
17	0.93795	1.3121	0.93844	1.2955	0.93842	1.2935	0.93835	1.2965	0.93892	1.3725	0.93839	1.3964
18	0.98201	0.3038	0.98201	0.3043	0.98200	0.3048	0.98199	0.3051	0.98205	0.3117	0.98206	0.3135
19	0.89786	3.6970	0.89866	3.6690	0.89856	3.6697	0.89841	3.6768	0.89930	3.8638	0.89826	3.9294
20	0.90462	3.6712	0.90552	3.6270	0.90547	3.6245	0.90532	3.6330	0.90631	3.8445	0.90522	3.9185

Table 8: Estimated values of μ for $n = 40$ for observations 21 until 40.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		p-boot		np-boot		np-boot	
	$\hat{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\tilde{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$
21	0.97785	2.4852	0.97815	2.4196	0.97816	2.4197	0.97811	2.4307	0.97846	2.5379	0.97810	2.6007
22	0.97141	1.3669	0.97149	1.3634	0.97146	1.3661	0.97144	1.3680	0.97157	1.3982	0.97148	1.4085
23	0.98232	0.4331	0.98234	0.4330	0.98233	0.4326	0.98234	0.4323	0.98241	0.4570	0.98244	0.4585
24	0.97211	1.2809	0.97219	1.2778	0.97215	1.2802	0.97214	1.2820	0.97226	1.3105	0.97218	1.3200
25	0.91094	2.2236	0.91144	2.2168	0.91131	2.2203	0.91121	2.2236	0.91175	2.2951	0.91107	2.3228
26	0.99623	0.0233	0.99623	0.0233	0.99624	0.0233	0.99624	0.0232	0.99628	0.0256	0.99628	0.0252
27	0.98186	0.2087	0.98184	0.2100	0.98183	0.2100	0.98183	0.2100	0.98187	0.2143	0.98192	0.2166
28	0.98579	0.1580	0.98578	0.1584	0.98577	0.1586	0.98577	0.1587	0.98582	0.1634	0.98584	0.1646
29	0.99109	0.1230	0.99110	0.1226	0.99110	0.1227	0.99110	0.1228	0.99117	0.1312	0.99115	0.1313
30	0.98713	0.1437	0.98713	0.1442	0.98712	0.1442	0.98713	0.1439	0.98717	0.1511	0.98722	0.1522
31	0.95757	6.8724	0.95797	6.7758	0.95793	6.7897	0.95786	6.8087	0.95827	7.0365	0.95781	7.1589
32	0.98757	0.3547	0.98763	0.3517	0.98763	0.3519	0.98762	0.3526	0.98773	0.3718	0.98766	0.3745
33	0.95759	2.9853	0.95771	2.9838	0.95765	2.9856	0.95763	2.9892	0.95780	3.0718	0.95767	3.0980
34	0.97058	1.3386	0.97065	1.3367	0.97062	1.3392	0.97060	1.3409	0.97072	1.3674	0.97064	1.3766
35	0.97648	1.5266	0.97663	1.5100	0.97661	1.5124	0.97659	1.5161	0.97678	1.5722	0.97661	1.5928
36	0.96553	1.6061	0.96559	1.6084	0.96555	1.6088	0.96553	1.6103	0.96565	1.6551	0.96560	1.6669
37	0.97824	0.9721	0.97833	0.9660	0.97831	0.9678	0.97829	0.9695	0.97843	1.0024	0.97833	1.0117
38	0.88094	6.2588	0.88213	6.1947	0.88206	6.1936	0.88186	6.2063	0.88316	6.5824	0.88165	6.7035
39	0.92631	1.4425	0.92671	1.4377	0.92660	1.4408	0.92652	1.4429	0.92693	1.4795	0.92641	1.4951
40	0.97234	0.8019	0.97236	0.8047	0.97233	0.8049	0.97233	0.8054	0.97240	0.8246	0.97240	0.8298

Table 9: Estimated values of ϕ for $n = 40$ for observations 1 until 20.

i	True	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		np-boot	
	ϕ_i	$\hat{\phi}_i$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\tilde{\phi}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$
1	1770.8	3029.1	68.054	1861.3	15.910	1663.4	10.169	2125.6	29.674
2	959.67	1421.0	9.6333	1001.7	3.4732	951.83	3.0914	1089.0	5.3961
3	2941.7	6339.4	692.50	2939.7	81.138	2361.6	34.781	3536.2	213.27
4	60.601	73.479	0.0123	61.313	0.0068	61.061	0.0069	66.301	0.0098
5	257.67	347.87	0.3260	265.33	0.1327	256.31	0.1191	294.61	0.2089
6	239.17	308.30	0.1628	245.17	0.0696	238.31	0.0642	269.20	0.1141
7	215.80	266.89	0.0776	219.99	0.0345	215.29	0.0336	237.73	0.0616
8	174.37	214.83	0.0531	177.46	0.0246	174.06	0.0240	192.51	0.0424
9	1201.1	1996.5	27.074	1258.5	6.7785	1140.1	4.6161	1437.9	12.362
10	42.483	50.631	0.0065	42.945	0.0037	42.900	0.0037	43.995	0.0044
11	445.50	598.31	0.7136	460.68	0.2667	441.88	0.2294	507.42	0.4530
12	56.060	67.187	0.0094	56.627	0.0054	56.471	0.0054	60.968	0.0077
13	45.972	55.403	0.0086	46.559	0.0049	46.466	0.0048	47.623	0.0056
14	5615.7	11685.	2277.4	5774.4	324.04	4721.4	133.08	6740.9	644.14
15	355.04	458.57	0.3073	364.99	0.1224	353.29	0.1115	397.95	0.2142
16	12.357	14.273	0.0006	12.431	0.0004	12.546	0.0003	12.715	0.0004
17	32.844	42.080	0.0102	33.430	0.0051	33.534	0.0051	36.444	0.0069
18	215.87	267.12	0.0936	220.10	0.0442	215.76	0.0435	235.81	0.0741
19	10.734	13.121	0.0011	10.906	0.0006	11.058	0.0006	11.452	0.0007
20	13.496	17.255	0.0027	13.777	0.0013	13.960	0.0013	14.747	0.0016

Table 10: Estimated values of ϕ for $n = 40$ for observations 21 until 40.

i	True	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		np-boot	
	ϕ_i	$\hat{\phi}_i$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\tilde{\phi}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$
21	98.278	139.68	0.1618	101.37	0.0661	100.08	0.0637	102.30	0.0745
22	81.514	96.913	0.0154	82.397	0.0088	81.888	0.0088	86.262	0.0123
23	438.48	646.61	1.8109	455.33	0.6103	430.67	0.5010	513.31	0.9936
24	85.347	101.64	0.0168	86.300	0.0095	85.725	0.0095	90.428	0.0135
25	12.081	13.979	0.0006	12.158	0.0004	12.277	0.0003	12.462	0.0004
26	6878.7	14673.	4140.1	7032.1	562.61	5693.9	216.64	8204.3	1048.4
27	282.12	361.31	0.1870	289.31	0.0770	280.89	0.0708	316.26	0.1327
28	352.09	452.61	0.3283	361.66	0.1399	351.18	0.1318	390.82	0.2357
29	751.25	1065.4	4.1163	781.77	1.5804	747.43	1.4258	848.19	2.4693
30	769.52	1177.0	6.4918	804.56	1.9558	748.37	1.4798	908.18	3.3472
31	35.909	45.474	0.0098	36.618	0.0050	36.509	0.0048	36.669	0.0051
32	339.05	458.89	0.8045	349.84	0.3545	340.78	0.3397	371.61	0.5103
33	48.458	56.311	0.0048	48.732	0.0029	48.711	0.0029	51.637	0.0041
34	79.804	94.260	0.0129	80.570	0.0074	80.097	0.0074	84.581	0.0106
35	100.14	126.94	0.0572	102.25	0.0293	101.28	0.0288	105.67	0.0367
36	74.761	88.166	0.0098	75.391	0.0056	74.957	0.0057	80.671	0.0087
37	123.37	153.22	0.0590	125.66	0.0310	124.25	0.0306	131.42	0.0421
38	8.7913	11.450	0.0016	9.0134	0.0007	9.1672	0.0007	9.5762	0.0008
39	15.961	18.414	0.0009	16.046	0.0005	16.152	0.0005	16.341	0.0006
40	115.31	138.36	0.0209	116.72	0.0108	115.33	0.0109	125.69	0.0181

Table 11: Simulation results for $n = 60$.

Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
β_0	1.5046	1.5025	1.5063	1.5016	1.5005
Bias	0.0046	0.0025	0.0063	0.0016	0.0005
Variance	0.0156	0.0156	0.0159	0.0156	0.0160
MSE	0.0156	0.0156	0.0159	0.0156	0.0160
β_1	0.4995	0.4996	0.4996	0.4997	0.5000
Bias	-0.0005	-0.0004	-0.0004	-0.0003	0.0000
Variance	0.0030	0.0030	0.0031	0.0030	0.0033
MSE	0.0030	0.0030	0.0031	0.0030	0.0033
β_2	1.9984	1.9992	1.9976	1.9997	2.0014
Bias	-0.0016	0.0008	-0.0024	-0.0003	0.0014
Variance	0.0037	0.0037	0.0038	0.0037	0.0039
MSE	0.0037	0.0037	0.0038	0.0037	0.0039
θ_0	1.7004	1.6948	1.6939	1.7089	1.7066
Bias	0.0004	-0.0052	-0.0061	0.0089	0.0066
Variance	0.0999	0.0962	0.1059	0.0956	0.0993
MSE	0.0999	0.0962	0.1059	0.0957	0.0994
θ_1	0.6966	0.6974	0.6955	0.6988	0.7015
Bias	-0.0034	-0.0026	-0.0045	-0.0012	0.0015
Variance	0.0589	0.0551	0.0650	0.0543	0.0581
MSE	0.0589	0.0551	0.0650	0.0543	0.0581
θ_2	3.0630	3.0107	3.1184	2.9955	3.0073
Bias	0.0630	0.0107	0.1184	-0.0045	0.0073
Variance	0.0265	0.0260	0.0274	0.0257	0.0271
MSE	0.0305	0.0262	0.0414	0.0257	0.0271

scheme is considerably larger than the ones of the corrective method. If the true value of ϕ is small, the parametric bootstrap outperforms the corrective method with respect to bias. The maximum likelihood estimator had the worst perfomance with respect to bias and MSE. The parametric bootstrap had, in general, the best performance with respect to MSE. Therefore, we conclude that the corrective method was satisfactory, but overall, the parametric bootstrap had the best performance. It is also noteworthy that, for the precision parameter ϕ, the correction schemes worked very well, and, therefore, their use produces an improved estimation.

In Table 6 the results for sample size $n = 40$ are presented with respect to the parameters β and θ. As observed in Table 3, the corrective method and the parametric bootstrap scheme had the best performance with respect to both bias and MSE. The nonparametric bootstrap scheme had performance worse than the MLE for the parameters β, and better than the MLE for the parameters θ, with respect to both bias and MSE. For this sample size, we observe again that the preventive estimator had a poor performance. The results show that both the corrective method and the parametric bootstrap produce better estimators than the MLE, with respect to bias and MSE, and again, that the estimates produced by the preventive method are not satisfactory. Finally, the behavior of the nonparametric bootstrap estimator is the same as the one for sample size $n = 20$.

Tables 7 and 8 contains the results for sample size $n = 40$ with respect to the parameter μ. Initially we note that, based on MSE, the corrective estimators had the best performance. We also observe that the maximum likelihood and parametric bootstrap estimators had similar performance. Finally, the nonparametric estimators had the worst performance with regard to MSE.

Tables 9 and 10 sumarize the results for sample size $n = 40$ with respect to the parameter ϕ. For this

Table 12: Estimated values of μ for $n = 60$ for observations 1 until 30.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		p-boot		np-boot		np-boot	
	$\hat{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\tilde{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$
1	0.94851	3.0577	0.94865	3.0528	0.94863	3.0590	0.94861	3.0605	0.94867	3.1232	0.94857	3.1344
2	0.98379	0.3952	0.98386	0.3922	0.98386	0.3927	0.98385	0.3931	0.98392	0.4095	0.98385	0.4123
3	0.98630	0.0577	0.98629	0.0578	0.98629	0.0579	0.98629	0.0579	0.98630	0.0594	0.98631	0.0595
4	0.94256	4.0143	0.94272	4.0065	0.94270	4.0161	0.94268	4.0182	0.94279	4.2206	0.94264	4.2429
5	0.90825	1.1968	0.90856	1.1956	0.90853	1.1985	0.90849	1.1990	0.90865	1.2481	0.90837	1.2543
6	0.99074	0.0254	0.99073	0.0254	0.99073	0.0255	0.99073	0.0255	0.99074	0.0265	0.99075	0.0266
7	0.98393	0.1028	0.98393	0.1029	0.98393	0.1031	0.98393	0.1031	0.98394	0.1044	0.98394	0.1045
8	0.97812	0.2439	0.97813	0.2442	0.97812	0.2446	0.97812	0.2447	0.97814	0.2504	0.97813	0.2507
9	0.97980	0.1898	0.97980	0.1900	0.97979	0.1904	0.97979	0.1905	0.97981	0.1952	0.97981	0.1954
10	0.99198	0.0193	0.99198	0.0193	0.99197	0.0194	0.99197	0.0194	0.99199	0.0200	0.99199	0.0201
11	0.92807	6.7434	0.92829	6.7353	0.92826	6.7497	0.92823	6.7528	0.92832	6.9123	0.92816	6.9388
12	0.95979	1.5525	0.95987	1.5509	0.95986	1.5545	0.95985	1.5552	0.95992	1.6338	0.95984	1.6405
13	0.97648	0.4977	0.97653	0.4968	0.97652	0.4977	0.97651	0.4979	0.97655	0.5077	0.97652	0.5091
14	0.97879	0.4744	0.97884	0.4728	0.97884	0.4736	0.97883	0.4739	0.97887	0.4862	0.97883	0.4881
15	0.96264	1.3531	0.96272	1.3514	0.96271	1.3540	0.96269	1.3546	0.96273	1.3791	0.96268	1.3831
16	0.96332	1.1294	0.96338	1.1291	0.96336	1.1316	0.96335	1.1320	0.96340	1.1746	0.96335	1.1785
17	0.92130	1.0687	0.92164	1.0642	0.92163	1.0670	0.92158	1.0677	0.92189	1.1409	0.92150	1.1489
18	0.96480	1.3207	0.96489	1.3178	0.96488	1.3203	0.96486	1.3210	0.96491	1.3447	0.96485	1.3491
19	0.86528	3.2908	0.86585	3.2893	0.86580	3.2987	0.86573	3.2998	0.86613	3.5018	0.86551	3.5203
20	0.94079	5.9637	0.94105	5.9313	0.94104	5.9464	0.94101	5.9508	0.94128	6.4000	0.94097	6.4448
21	0.99231	0.0820	0.99234	0.0814	0.99234	0.0815	0.99233	0.0816	0.99238	0.0868	0.99234	0.0873
22	0.99659	0.0056	0.99659	0.0056	0.99659	0.0056	0.99659	0.0056	0.99660	0.0060	0.99660	0.0059
23	0.96626	0.9311	0.96630	0.9309	0.96629	0.9330	0.96629	0.9334	0.96633	0.9773	0.96629	0.9805
24	0.95962	1.8661	0.95974	1.8617	0.95972	1.8652	0.95971	1.8662	0.95976	1.9004	0.95969	1.9071
25	0.99291	0.0245	0.99290	0.0245	0.99291	0.0245	0.99291	0.0245	0.99293	0.0258	0.99293	0.0258
26	0.98481	0.2667	0.98485	0.2654	0.98485	0.2658	0.98484	0.2660	0.98489	0.2761	0.98485	0.2774
27	0.97509	0.3725	0.97511	0.3728	0.97510	0.3735	0.97510	0.3737	0.97512	0.3811	0.97510	0.3818
28	0.99005	0.0375	0.99004	0.0375	0.99004	0.0376	0.99004	0.0376	0.99006	0.0387	0.99006	0.0387
29	0.99756	0.0053	0.99756	0.0053	0.99756	0.0053	0.99756	0.0053	0.99758	0.0058	0.99757	0.0058
30	0.99502	0.0122	0.99502	0.0122	0.99502	0.0122	0.99502	0.0122	0.99503	0.0128	0.99503	0.0128

Table 13: Estimated values of μ for $n = 60$ for observations 31 until 60.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		p-boot		np-boot		np-boot	
	$\hat{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\tilde{\mu}_i$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\mu}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$	$\overline{\overline{\mu}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^5$
31	0.99415	0.0184	0.99415	0.0184	0.99415	0.0185	0.99415	0.0185	0.99417	0.0197	0.99416	0.0197
32	0.99216	0.0559	0.99217	0.0557	0.99217	0.0558	0.99217	0.0558	0.99220	0.0591	0.99218	0.0593
33	0.97738	0.2732	0.97739	0.2736	0.97738	0.2741	0.97738	0.2742	0.97740	0.2838	0.97739	0.2842
34	0.98368	0.1268	0.98369	0.1270	0.98368	0.1272	0.98368	0.1272	0.98369	0.1289	0.98369	0.1290
35	0.97015	1.2755	0.97026	1.2683	0.97026	1.2705	0.97024	1.2715	0.97032	1.3055	0.97023	1.3126
36	0.94593	3.2106	0.94606	3.2069	0.94604	3.2139	0.94602	3.2155	0.94609	3.3192	0.94598	3.3329
37	0.95951	2.3624	0.95966	2.3515	0.95965	2.3557	0.95963	2.3574	0.95972	2.4107	0.95960	2.4225
38	0.93229	8.6609	0.93261	8.6077	0.93261	8.6301	0.93257	8.6368	0.93291	9.3024	0.93251	9.3723
39	0.93427	5.3243	0.93446	5.3179	0.93444	5.3293	0.93441	5.3319	0.93449	5.4728	0.93435	5.4948
40	0.96087	1.3510	0.96094	1.3505	0.96092	1.3532	0.96092	1.3538	0.96095	1.3912	0.96090	1.3956
41	0.98101	0.1971	0.98102	0.1972	0.98102	0.1975	0.98102	0.1976	0.98103	0.2003	0.98103	0.2005
42	0.98213	0.1386	0.98213	0.1388	0.98213	0.1390	0.98213	0.1391	0.98214	0.1410	0.98214	0.1411
43	0.98439	0.1327	0.98440	0.1327	0.98440	0.1329	0.98439	0.1330	0.98441	0.1353	0.98441	0.1355
44	0.98581	0.0634	0.98580	0.0635	0.98579	0.0636	0.98579	0.0636	0.98581	0.0652	0.98581	0.0653
45	0.96663	1.0672	0.96670	1.0656	0.96669	1.0676	0.96668	1.0681	0.96671	1.0864	0.96667	1.0895
46	0.97528	0.4526	0.97531	0.4524	0.97530	0.4532	0.97529	0.4534	0.97532	0.4604	0.97530	0.4613
47	0.99004	0.0224	0.99003	0.0224	0.99003	0.0224	0.99003	0.0224	0.99004	0.0228	0.99004	0.0229
48	0.98474	0.0802	0.98474	0.0803	0.98473	0.0804	0.98473	0.0804	0.98474	0.0817	0.98475	0.0817
49	0.99354	0.0221	0.99354	0.0221	0.99354	0.0221	0.99354	0.0221	0.99356	0.0235	0.99355	0.0235
50	0.98988	0.1142	0.98989	0.1138	0.98990	0.1139	0.98990	0.1140	0.98995	0.1220	0.98992	0.1217
51	0.98646	0.0657	0.98645	0.0658	0.98645	0.0659	0.98645	0.0659	0.98646	0.0667	0.98647	0.0667
52	0.92288	7.7763	0.92312	7.7688	0.92309	7.7860	0.92306	7.7895	0.92316	8.0112	0.92297	8.0444
53	0.94860	3.0225	0.94873	3.0171	0.94872	3.0242	0.94870	3.0258	0.94880	3.1809	0.94867	3.1969
54	0.98109	0.2037	0.98110	0.2038	0.98109	0.2042	0.98109	0.2043	0.98111	0.2071	0.98110	0.2074
55	0.95698	1.8418	0.95708	1.8398	0.95706	1.8435	0.95705	1.8444	0.95709	1.8839	0.95702	1.8899
56	0.94157	4.1167	0.94173	4.1093	0.94171	4.1190	0.94169	4.1212	0.94180	4.3166	0.94164	4.3388
57	0.95495	2.0132	0.95505	2.0114	0.95503	2.0156	0.95502	2.0165	0.95506	2.0675	0.95499	2.0745
58	0.99070	0.0199	0.99069	0.0199	0.99069	0.0200	0.99069	0.0200	0.99070	0.0205	0.99071	0.0206
59	0.98021	0.2164	0.98021	0.2166	0.98021	0.2171	0.98021	0.2172	0.98024	0.2291	0.98022	0.2294
60	0.96732	0.8075	0.96736	0.8076	0.96735	0.8092	0.96734	0.8096	0.96737	0.8327	0.96734	0.8349

Table 14: Estimated values of ϕ for $n = 60$ for observations 1 until 30.

i	True	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		np-boot	
	ϕ_i	$\hat{\phi}_i$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\tilde{\phi}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$
1	28.336	30.011	0.0009	28.460	0.0007	28.793	0.0007	28.813	0.0008
2	183.72	214.70	0.1450	186.54	0.0940	187.63	0.0943	190.42	0.1049
3	623.86	783.08	0.8483	637.06	0.3770	615.45	0.3434	637.20	0.4139
4	29.638	32.969	0.0015	30.024	0.0011	30.101	0.0011	30.249	0.0012
5	11.385	12.224	0.0002	11.496	0.0001	11.637	0.0001	11.607	0.0001
6	1936.2	2820.9	31.510	1994.3	10.719	1858.5	8.7753	1975.3	12.579
7	334.56	388.42	0.1007	338.44	0.0540	333.00	0.0525	340.76	0.0577
8	190.37	217.33	0.0290	192.45	0.0169	190.15	0.0166	193.66	0.0179
9	234.57	271.95	0.0512	237.57	0.0280	233.85	0.0272	238.80	0.0299
10	1495.4	1929.1	6.7590	1524.6	2.8932	1466.1	2.6041	1530.2	3.1911
11	16.194	17.057	0.0003	16.274	0.0002	16.507	0.0002	16.471	0.0003
12	62.674	71.139	0.0060	63.538	0.0040	63.215	0.0040	63.914	0.0043
13	112.79	123.84	0.0171	113.52	0.0126	113.95	0.0127	115.12	0.0136
14	127.31	141.69	0.0321	128.41	0.0231	129.05	0.0232	130.48	0.0251
15	50.908	54.476	0.0025	51.129	0.0020	51.519	0.0020	51.756	0.0021
16	67.847	75.284	0.0046	68.498	0.0032	68.332	0.0032	69.005	0.0034
17	18.741	22.188	0.0016	19.207	0.0010	19.210	0.0010	19.326	0.0011
18	53.274	57.218	0.0037	53.553	0.0029	54.055	0.0030	54.296	0.0031
19	6.1804	7.0164	0.0001	6.3181	0.0001	6.3891	0.0001	6.3720	0.0001
20	37.974	47.434	0.0085	39.074	0.0046	38.636	0.0045	39.198	0.0051
21	840.75	1063.0	4.2129	854.48	2.2201	844.57	2.1370	872.19	2.5198
22	17470	33191	14821	17324	2650.2	14743	1637.7	16942	3861.7
23	88.824	101.36	0.0105	90.021	0.0067	89.288	0.0066	90.512	0.0072
24	41.464	44.323	0.0023	41.681	0.0019	42.147	0.0019	42.262	0.0020
25	4942.5	8778.9	796.04	5024.8	175.69	4406.4	120.53	4904.7	237.83
26	228.26	263.24	0.1540	231.01	0.1014	231.32	0.1009	235.17	0.1122
27	133.92	149.16	0.0122	134.97	0.0080	134.19	0.0080	136.09	0.0085
28	834.22	1018.7	1.2950	846.76	0.6351	825.35	0.5958	852.99	0.6903
29	23640	43563	22547	23263	4383.7	20224	2945.3	23053	6021.5
30	10969	21679	7431.4	10862	1203.8	9077.1	705.40	10524	1851.2

Table 15: Estimated values of ϕ for $n = 60$ for observations 31 until 60.

i	True	MLE		Cox-Snell		p-boot		np-boot	
	ϕ_i	$\hat{\phi}_i$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\tilde{\phi}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{1,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$	$\overline{\overline{\phi}}_{2,i}$	MSE$\times 10^{-5}$
31	2465.2	3299.1	29.664	2510.6	12.348	2405.9	11.019	2528.1	13.718
32	975.65	1214.3	3.6737	990.08	1.9334	972.07	1.8371	1005.3	2.1481
33	197.61	230.03	0.0428	200.38	0.0239	197.23	0.0231	201.27	0.0255
34	290.07	331.45	0.0744	292.80	0.0439	289.50	0.0432	295.47	0.0471
35	63.746	70.602	0.0114	64.452	0.0084	65.238	0.0085	65.605	0.0091
36	28.936	31.051	0.0009	29.124	0.0007	29.343	0.0007	29.410	0.0007
37	38.716	42.101	0.0035	39.078	0.0027	39.639	0.0028	39.728	0.0029
38	29.493	37.284	0.0061	30.411	0.0033	30.111	0.0032	30.521	0.0037
39	19.193	20.294	0.0004	19.291	0.0003	19.530	0.0003	19.509	0.0003
40	53.662	58.158	0.0024	53.994	0.0018	54.150	0.0018	54.503	0.0019
41	208.25	233.97	0.0344	209.88	0.0219	208.39	0.0218	211.95	0.0234
42	270.23	310.60	0.0589	273.13	0.0328	269.36	0.0321	275.05	0.0349
43	293.62	334.80	0.0908	296.24	0.0560	293.51	0.0551	299.42	0.0604
44	557.66	690.46	0.5811	568.65	0.2645	551.07	0.2434	569.32	0.2888
45	61.054	65.632	0.0040	61.340	0.0031	61.781	0.0032	62.133	0.0033
46	113.76	124.50	0.0113	114.39	0.0082	114.48	0.0083	115.74	0.0088
47	1185.9	1546.1	4.3867	1213.1	1.7976	1161.3	1.5920	1212.3	2.0038
48	416.39	495.70	0.2017	422.59	0.0993	413.21	0.0944	424.45	0.1068
49	1942.0	2538.4	15.298	1976.5	6.7135	1904.3	6.0813	1992.1	7.4153
50	3384.0	6771.7	742.04	3342.6	120.27	2812.3	74.335	3228.8	185.45
51	470.75	556.27	0.2506	476.88	0.1281	467.43	0.1228	480.04	0.1378
52	14.686	15.511	0.0002	14.770	0.0002	14.970	0.0002	14.934	0.0002
53	37.545	42.075	0.0024	38.050	0.0017	38.052	0.0017	38.315	0.0018
54	204.71	229.58	0.0349	206.26	0.0226	204.97	0.0225	208.40	0.0242
55	40.884	43.632	0.0015	41.066	0.0012	41.387	0.0012	41.531	0.0013
56	27.923	30.801	0.0013	28.251	0.0009	28.362	0.0009	28.475	0.0010
57	39.067	41.825	0.0014	39.266	0.0011	39.533	0.0011	39.678	0.0012
58	1604.0	2205.3	13.224	1647.4	4.9603	1557.0	4.2277	1639.4	5.6607
59	327.94	410.19	0.2761	335.44	0.1322	325.32	0.1216	335.25	0.1439
60	80.047	88.150	0.0050	80.661	0.0036	80.508	0.0036	81.329	0.0038

sample size the MLE had the biggest bias and MSE, and hence was the poorest estimator considered in this table. On the opposite direction, the parametric bootstrap estimator had the smallest MSE, followed by the corrective method. However, if the true value is large, the corrective method has bias smaller than the parametric bootstrap. It is also noteworthy that for large values of ϕ the parametric bootstrap method tends to underestimate the parameter. We note, again, that both the corrective and parametric bootstrap estimators provide better results than the MLE, with respect to both bias and MSE.

Table 11 summarizes the results for sample size $n = 60$ with respect to the parameters β and θ. We begin by noting that even for a large sample size the preventive estimator had the poorest performance. The parametric bootstrap estimator had, in general, a better performance than the MLE, with respect to both bias and MSE. The nonparametric bootstrap estimator showed the same behavior it did for the sample sizes $n = 20$ and $n = 40$, i.e., had better perfomance for θ and worse performance for β when compared to the MLE. Finally, the best performance was obtained by the corrective estimator, which had, in general, the smallest bias and MSE. Hence, the corrective method can be effective even for large sample sizes.

Tables 12 and 13 present the results for sample size $n = 60$ with respect to the parameter μ. We note that both nonparametric estimators had the worst performance with respect to MSE. Further, the corrective method presented the best performance with respect to MSE, nevertheless it was not much better than the MLE. The parametric bootstrap had a performance worse than both maximum likelihood and the corrective estimator, but better than the nonparametric estimator. But, overall, all estimators were similar.

Tables 14 and 15 present the results for sample size $n = 60$ with respect to the parameter ϕ. The MLE had the worst performance with respect to both bias and MSE. Considering the MSE, the best estimator was the parametric bootstrap, which had consistently the smallest MSE. The parametric bootstrap was closely followed by the corrective estimator which had a similar performance, except when the true value of ϕ was large, in this case, the MSE of the parametric bootstrap was considerably smaller than the MSE of the corrective method, but, on the other hand, the bias of the corrective method was also considerably smaller than the bias of the parametric bootstrap. Finally, the nonparametric bootstrap outperformed the MLE. Therefore, we conclude that even for sample size large the corrective method and the parametric bootstrap may produce improved estimators.

We have performed a second set of simulations, but now we have two goals. First, to check the performance of the MLE against the proposed estimators, but secondly, we will consider a model which is linearizable, and we will compare the behavior of the estimators for both the linear and non-linear fits. We hope this will give another motivation for the usage of the class of nonlinear regression models that we are introducing here in this paper. This strategy was also used by Cook et al. (1986). In this experiment we consider a linearizable nonlinear model with logit link for the regression parameters and a linearizable nonlinear model with identity link for the precision parameter:

$$\text{logit}\mu_i = \beta_0 x_i^{\beta_1},$$

$$\phi_i = \theta_0 x_i^{\theta_1}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where the true values of the parameters were taken as $\beta_0 = 0.7$ and $\beta_1 = 0.5$; and $\theta_0 = 100$ and $\theta_1 = 2$. Note also that here the elements of the $n \times 2$ matrix $\tilde{X}$ are: $\tilde{X}(\beta)_{i,1} = x_i^{\beta_1}$ and $\tilde{X}(\beta)_{i,2} = \beta_0 \log(x_i)(x_i^{\beta_1})$. The explanatory variable x was generated from random draws of an exponential distributions with mean 1 for $n = 20, 40$ and 60. The values of x were held constant throughout the simulations and were the same for both the linearizable and the nonlinear model. The total number of Monte Carlo replications was set at $5,000$ for each sample size. The number of bootstrap replications was set to 600 for both bootstrap methods.

To fit the linearized model, we consider the model in the following sense:

$$g(\mu_i) = \gamma_0 + \beta_1 z_i,$$

$$h(\phi_i) = \zeta_0 + \theta_1 z_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where $\gamma_0 = \log(\beta_0)$, $\zeta_0 = \log(\theta_0)$, $z_i = \log(x_i)$, $g(\cdot) = \log(\text{logit}(\cdot))$ and finally, $h(\cdot) = \log(\cdot)$. Hence, we can obtain the MLE of β_0 in the linearized model simply by exponentiation of γ_0, and analogously to obtain the MLE of θ_0.

Table 16: Simulation results for $n = 20$.

Model	Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
Linear	β_0	0.7008	0.7020	0.6998	0.7022	0.7040
	Bias	0.0008	0.0020	-0.0002	0.0022	0.0040
	Variance	0.0039	0.0039	0.0039	0.0039	0.0040
	MSE	0.0039	0.0039	0.0039	0.0039	0.0040
	β_1	0.5025	0.5014	0.5035	0.5014	0.4991
	Bias	0.0025	0.0014	0.0035	0.0014	-0.0009
	Variance	0.0115	0.0115	0.0116	0.0115	0.0132
	MSE	0.0116	0.0115	0.0116	0.0115	0.0132
	θ_0	139.37	111.43	171.78	107.73	109.10
	Bias	39.370	11.430	71.780	7.7300	9.1000
	Variance	3849.4	2444.3	5917.0	2307.3	2433.6
	MSE	5399.1	2575.0	11070	2367.1	2516.3
	θ_1	2.0871	2.0215	2.1603	1.9945	1.9791
	Bias	0.0871	0.0215	0.1603	-0.0055	-0.0209
	Variance	0.1548	0.1489	0.1630	0.1488	0.1530
	MSE	0.1624	0.1494	0.1887	0.1488	0.1535
Nonlinear	β_0	0.7016	0.7006	0.7028	0.7005	0.7014
	Bias	0.0016	0.0006	0.0028	0.0005	0.0014
	Variance	0.0038	0.0038	0.0038	0.0038	0.00394
	MSE	0.0038	0.0038	0.0038	0.0038	0.0039
	β_1	0.5007	0.4997	0.5008	0.4998	0.4977
	Bias	0.0007	-0.0003	0.0008	-0.0002	-0.0023
	Variance	0.0115	0.0115	0.0115	0.0115	0.0128
	MSE	0.0115	0.0115	0.0115	0.0115	0.0129
	θ_0	140.33	101.14	199.46	83.136	79.011
	Bias	40.330	1.1400	99.460	-16.864	-20.989
	Variance	3822.6	1961.5	7906.2	1310.9	3575.2
	MSE	5448.8	1962.8	17798	1595.3	4015.7
	θ_1	2.0923	2.0264	2.2071	1.9991	1.9863
	Bias	0.0923	0.0264	0.2071	-0.0009	-0.0137
	Variance	0.1558	0.1496	0.1667	0.1482	0.1536
	MSE	0.1643	0.1503	0.2096	0.1482	0.1538

Table 16 presents the results for $n = 20$. The best estimator, with respect to both bias and MSE, was the parametric bootstrap. The preventive estimator had the poorest performance. Considering both the linear and nonlinear models, the nonparametric bootstrap had better performance than the MLE for the parameter θ and worse for the parameter β. The corrective estimator had a good performance, in the sense that only the parametric bootstrap had outperformed it. Now, comparing the linear and nonlinear models, we note that the MLE was similar for both models. Comparing the corrective and parametric bootstrap estimators for both models, the estimators from the nonlinear model had the best performance. The nonparametric bootstrap estimator had a similar performance in both models, except for θ_0 which was considerably worse in the nonlinear model. Hence, we conclude that for the estimators of interest, i.e., corrective and parametric bootstrap, the nonlinear model had the best performance and

Table 17: Simulation results for $n = 40$.

Model	Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
Linear	β_0	0.7001	0.7013	0.6990	0.7018	0.7015
	Bias	0.0001	0.0013	-0.0010	0.0018	0.0015
	Variance	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023
	MSE	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023
	β_1	0.5015	0.4999	0.5030	0.4994	0.4996
	Bias	0.0015	-0.0001	0.0030	-0.0006	-0.0004
	Variance	0.0097	0.0096	0.0097	0.0097	0.0098
	MSE	0.0097	0.0096	0.0097	0.0097	0.0098
	θ_0	116.87	104.55	130.11	104.18	104.25
	Bias	16.870	4.5500	30.110	4.1800	4.2500
	Variance	1081.2	861.77	1348.1	882.60	862.99
	MSE	1365.7	882.46	2254.8	900.09	881.06
	θ_1	2.0346	2.0076	2.0627	2.0029	1.9939
	Bias	0.0346	0.0076	0.0627	0.0029	-0.0061
	Variance	0.0663	0.0647	0.0682	0.0662	0.0657
	MSE	0.0675	0.0647	0.0721	0.0662	0.0657
Nonlinear	β_0	0.7002	0.6999	0.7005	0.6999	0.7000
	Bias	0.0002	-0.0001	0.0005	-0.0001	0.0000
	Variance	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023
	MSE	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023	0.0023
	β_1	0.5017	0.5001	0.5029	0.5002	0.4998
	Bias	0.0017	0.0001	0.0029	0.0002	-0.0002
	Variance	0.0096	0.0095	0.0096	0.0095	0.0097
	MSE	0.0096	0.0095	0.0096	0.0095	0.0097
	θ_0	116.85	100.38	137.00	97.198	97.435
	Bias	16.850	0.3800	37.000	-2.8020	-2.5650
	Variance	1057.6	775.37	1466.5	724.96	766.40
	MSE	1341.7	775.51	2835.2	732.81	772.98
	θ_1	2.0327	2.0054	2.0726	1.9997	1.9929
	Bias	0.0327	0.0054	0.0726	-0.0003	-0.0071
	Variance	0.0631	0.0616	0.0649	0.0617	0.0627
	MSE	0.0642	0.0616	0.0702	0.0617	0.0627

should be used instead of its linearized version if one aims to obtain better performance with respect to MSE and bias.

Table 17 presents the results for $n = 40$. The best performance, with respect to both bias and MSE, was achieved by the corrective estimator. Considering both the linear and nonlinear models, the nonparametric bootstrap had better performance than the MLE for the parameter θ and worse for the parameter β. The preventive estimator had the worst performance. The parametric bootstrap estimator had a good performance, in the sense that only the corrective estimator had a best performance. Now, comparing the linear and nonlinear models, we note that the MLE was similar for both models. Comparing the corrective, parametric bootstrap and nonparametric estimators for both models, the estimators from the nonlinear model had the best performance. Here, we conclude that, for this sample

Table 18: Simulation results for $n = 60$.

Model	Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
Linear	β_0	0.6718	0.6768	0.6712	0.7322	0.6659
	Bias	-0.0282	-0.3232	-0.0288	0.0322	-0.0341
	Variance	0.0101	0.0076	0.0101	0.0109	0.0146
	MSE	0.0109	0.0082	0.0109	0.0119	0.0158
	β_1	0.5435	0.5327	0.5442	0.4705	0.5582
	Bias	0.0435	0.0327	0.0442	-0.0295	0.0582
	Variance	0.0249	0.0168	0.0249	0.0200	0.0422
	MSE	0.0268	0.0178	0.0268	0.0209	0.0455
	θ_0	100.99	93.896	108.46	108.93	93.676
	Bias	0.9900	6.1040	8.4600	8.9300	-6.3240
	Variance	1471.2	1270.5	1703.6	1307.1	1299.8
	MSE	1472.2	1307.7	1775.2	1386.8	1339.8
	θ_1	1.9216	1.9064	1.9358	2.0261	1.8697
	Bias	-0.0784	-0.0936	-0.0642	0.0261	-0.1303
	Variance	0.1029	0.1032	0.1059	0.1629	0.1693
	MSE	0.1090	0.1120	0.1100	0.1636	0.1862
Nonlinear	β_0	0.6977	0.6975	0.6981	0.6976	0.6973
	Bias	-0.0023	-0.0025	-0.0019	-0.0024	-0.0027
	Variance	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0035
	MSE	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0033	0.0035
	β_1	0.4818	0.4925	0.4716	0.4826	0.4862
	Bias	-0.0182	-0.0075	-0.0284	-0.0174	-0.0138
	Variance	0.0212	0.0058	0.0415	0.0201	0.01867
	MSE	0.0212	0.0059	0.0416	0.0201	0.01869
	θ_0	109.19	100.93	120.89	99.256	97.975
	Bias	9.1900	0.9300	20.890	-0.7440	-2.0250
	Variance	635.41	451.46	777.70	532.02	522.11
	MSE	719.92	452.33	1214.2	532.57	526.21
	θ_1	1.9989	1.9839	2.0256	1.9936	1.9776
	Bias	-0.0011	-0.0161	0.0256	-0.0064	-0.0224
	Variance	0.0323	0.0320	0.0373	0.0333	0.0317
	MSE	0.0323	0.0323	0.0380	0.0333	0.0322

size, the corrective estimator along with the bootstrap based estimators had a better performance when modelling the nonlinear model, than when modelling its linearized version.

Table 18 presents the results for $n = 60$. The best performance, with respect to both bias and MSE, was achieved by the corrective and parametric bootstrap estimators, however, their estimates were not far from the ones obtained by the MLE, this is probably due to the large sample size. The preventive estimator had the worst performance and the nonparametric bootstrap estimator had a similar performance to the MLE. It is noteworthy that the best estimates were obtained by the corrective estimator in the nonlinear model, followed by the parametric bootstrap estimator also in the nonlinear model. Comparing the linear and nonlinear models, we note that the MLE was similar for both models. Comparing the corrective, parametric bootstrap and nonparametric estimators for both models, the

estimators from the nonlinear model had the best performance. Therefore, we conclude that for all sample sizes the nonlinear model should be preferred to its linearized version.

7 Application to real data

We now present an application of the linear beta regression model with dispersion covariates, the particular case considered in Section 5. The source of the data is Prater (1956). We want to model the proportion of crude oil that is converted to petrol after fractional distillation. We have two explanatory variables for this model. The first is the level of crude oil, where 10 different possible levels correspond to the proportion of crude oil that was vaporized. The second is the temperature in Fahrenheit at which all petrol that is contained in the amount of crude oil vaporizes. Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) and Ospina et al. (2006) used this data as an illustration of the linear beta regression model and of some bias-correction schemes for the model, respectively.

The sample size is $n = 32$. The model specification consists of two parts as seen in equation (3). The first, which is related to the mean, includes an intercept ($x_1 = 1$), 9 different dummy variables ($x_2, \ldots, x_{10}$) to represent the 10 possible different situations for the level of crude oil and the covariate x_{11}, measuring the temperature in Fahrenheit degrees at which all petrol vaporizes. The second, which is related to the precision parameter, includes an intercept ($z_1 = 1$) and the covariate $z_2 = x_{11}$.

Table 19: Statistics and p-values of the LRT and ST.

Test	Stat. value	p-value
LRT	4.35902	0.03681
ST	6.57124	0.01036

The logit link function was used to relate the mean of the response variable to the linear predictor, and the log link function was used to relate the precision parameter to its linear predictor. The unknown coefficients were estimated through maximum likelihood using the quasi-Newton optimization method BFGS (see, for instance, Press et al., 1992) with analytical derivatives. The corrective (based on Cox and Snell, 1968), preventive (based on Firth, 1993) and bootstrap bias corrected (based on Efron, 1979) bias corrected schemes considered in Sections 3 and 4 were also computed.

We can then write the model we are considering as

$$\text{logit}(\mu_i) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \beta_3 x_{3i} + \beta_4 x_{4i} + \beta_5 x_{5i} + \beta_6 x_{6i} + \beta_7 x_{7i} + \beta_8 x_{8i} + \beta_9 x_{9i} + \beta_{10} x_{10i} + \beta_{11} x_{11i},$$

$$\log(\phi_i) = \theta_1 + \theta_2 z_{2i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, 32,$$

where $\text{logit}(x) = \log(x/(1-x))$.

Looking at Table 20 we see that θ_2 has an standard error of 0.00361. Thus, if we use the asymptotic normality to test if $\theta_2 = 0$, one would obtain the p-value 5.65×10^{-5}, which indicates the significance of this parameter. As a further study on this direction we considered the likelihood ratio test (LRT) and the score test (ST), to test the null hypothesis that the true model does not contain θ_2 (that is, $\theta_2 = 0$), which was the model considered by Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004), and Ospina et al. (2006), versus, the full model considered above (that is, $\theta_2 \neq 0$). The value of the statistics together with the p-value obtained by the comparison with the quantiles of a χ^2_1 distribution are given below in Table 19. By looking at Table 19 we may conclude that the null hypothesis (that $\theta_2 = 0$) should be rejected, thus showing that the general model introduced in Section 2 may be useful to practioners.

Table 20 presents the maximum likelihood estimates along with their corrected versions and the corresponding standard errors. The adjusted versions are the corrective bias-corrected estimator (Cox-Snell), the preventive bias-corrected estimator (Firth), the parametric bootstrap bias-corrective estimator (p-boot) and the nonparametric bootstrap bias-corrected estimator (np-boot). It can be seen that the estimates and corrected estimates for the parameters β's are very similar, however, for the parameters θ's, we observe some difference between the maximum likelihood estimate and the corrected ones.

In Table 21 we give the maximum likelihood estimates of μ and ϕ together with their corrected versions. We then see that there are not large differences between the estimates of μ and the corrected

Table 20: Estimated values of the parameters and their standard errors.

Parameter	MLE	Cox-Snell	Firth	p-boot	np-boot
β_1	-5.92323	-5.91695	-5.92336	-5.91213	-5.92425
	(0.18352)	(0.22155)	(0.15302)	(0.20352)	(0.14326)
β_2	1.60198	1.60063	1.60179	1.60231	1.61022
	(0.06385)	(0.08602)	(0.05271)	(0.06851)	(0.07535)
β_3	1.29726	1.29592	1.29800	1.29429	1.29766
	(0.09910)	(0.12392)	(0.08239)	(0.10315)	(0.09109)
β_4	1.56533	1.56363	1.56472	1.56333	1.58932
	(0.09973)	(0.12376)	(0.08300)	(0.11973)	(0.12473)
β_5	1.03007	1.02919	1.03019	1.03334	1.03327
	(0.06328)	(0.08554)	(0.05223)	(0.06728)	(0.06998)
β_6	1.15416	1.15318	1.15416	1.15399	1.15456
	(0.06564)	(0.08771)	(0.05424)	(0.07533)	(0.06167)
β_7	1.01944	1.01857	1.01991	1.01744	1.01934
	(0.06635)	(0.08925)	(0.05478)	(0.06323)	(0.06835)
β_8	0.62225	0.62171	0.62038	0.62111	0.62448
	(0.06563)	(0.08921)	(0.05416)	(0.07563)	(0.07599)
β_9	0.56458	0.56415	0.56485	0.56558	0.56651
	(0.06018)	(0.08321)	(0.04957)	(0.07066)	(0.07538)
β_{10}	0.35943	0.35906	0.36046	0.35911	0.36433
	(0.06714)	(0.09243)	(0.05532)	(0.08332)	(0.07755)
β_{11}	0.01035	0.01034	0.01035	0.01035	0.01037
	(0.00043)	(0.00052)	(0.00036)	(0.00049)	(0.00066)
θ_1	1.36408	1.98699	1.64216	1.88568	1.45548
	(1.22578)	(1.22669)	(1.22819)	(1.22877)	(1.22439)
θ_2	0.01457	0.01147	0.01483	0.01266	0.01387
	(0.00361)	(0.00362)	(0.00362)	(0.00374)	(0.00369)

estimates of μ, nevertheless, for the parameter ϕ, we note considerably differences between the maximum likelihood estimates and the corrected ones.

8 Conclusions

We defined a general beta regression models which allows a regression structure on the precision parameter, and both the regression structures on the mean and on the precision parameters are allowed to be nonlinear. Then, using the approximation theory developed by Cox and Snell (1968), we calculate $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{-1}\right)$ bias for the MLEs for β and θ. Our results generalize the formulae obtained by Ospina et al. (2006). We then defined bias-free estimator to order $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{-1}\right)$, by using the expressions obtained through Cox and Snell's (1968) formulae and Firth's (1993) estimating equation. We also considered two schemes of bias correction based on bootstrap. We use simulation in a nonlinear beta regression model with nonlinear dispersion covariates to conclude the superiority of the corrective and parametric bootstrap methods of bias correction over the other methods presented here with regard to both bias reduction and mean squared error. In fact, the parametric bootstrap presented, in general, the smallest mean squared error, and the corrective method the smallest bias. Further, the corrective method has an advantage over the parametric bootstrap, which is the fact that the parametric bootstrap is computer intensive whereas the corrective method is not. The simulation also considered another study, to check if a nonlinear model which can be linearized should be estimated through a nonlinear model, or through a linear model. The simulation showed that the nonlinear model should be preferred, showing that the general model we are presenting has the potential to be very useful to practioners. The paper is concluded with an empirical application to illustrate the usefulness of our results, and more speciffically, the usefulness of considering a model with dispersion covariates.

Table 21: Estimated values of μ and ϕ.

i	MLE		Cox-Snell		Firth		p-boot		np-boot	
	μ_i	ϕ_i	μ_i	ϕ_i	μ_i	ϕ_i	μ_i	ϕ_i	μ_i	ϕ_i
1	0.0999	77.500	0.0999	66.000	0.0996	92.800	0.0996	66.900	0.0998	53.600
2	0.1865	215.00	0.1866	154.50	0.1863	279.50	0.1863	203.80	0.1863	200.00
3	0.3214	596.30	0.3214	311.10	0.3212	798.10	0.3213	577.10	0.3214	658.30
4	0.4737	1471.7	0.4737	432.20	0.4736	1941.1	0.4737	1371.2	0.4737	1772.5
5	0.0856	93.700	0.0855	77.900	0.0854	114.40	0.0853	82.800	0.0853	69.400
6	0.1421	208.80	0.1419	151.10	0.1418	271.00	0.1418	197.60	0.1419	193.00
7	0.2628	613.90	0.2626	316.30	0.2625	821.80	0.2625	593.90	0.2625	680.20
8	0.1032	85.800	0.1031	72.200	0.1028	103.90	0.1029	75.100	0.1029	61.700
9	0.1765	205.80	0.1763	149.40	0.1760	266.90	0.1761	194.60	0.1761	189.60
10	0.3024	554.40	0.3022	298.20	0.3019	741.60	0.3021	536.90	0.3023	606.30
11	0.0788	120.00	0.0787	96.300	0.0785	149.90	0.0786	108.90	0.0786	96.200
12	0.1436	309.50	0.1437	203.00	0.1434	408.80	0.1435	297.80	0.1435	309.40
13	0.2475	798.10	0.2475	362.10	0.2473	1067.5	0.2474	767.40	0.2475	911.30
14	0.3439	1537.5	0.3439	432.60	0.3437	2024.5	0.3438	1427.9	0.3437	1857.2
15	0.1695	342.80	0.1696	218.20	0.1693	454.30	0.1694	330.70	0.1694	348.80
16	0.2754	821.70	0.2755	366.90	0.2752	1098.8	0.2753	789.40	0.2753	941.10
17	0.3369	1235.6	0.3369	422.30	0.3367	1639.2	0.3368	1164.7	0.3368	1469.0
18	0.1054	191.30	0.1054	141.00	0.1053	247.10	0.1052	180.10	0.1052	173.40
19	0.2360	742.00	0.2361	349.60	0.2359	993.00	0.2359	715.00	0.2359	840.60
20	0.3231	1368.3	0.3231	429.60	0.3230	1809.4	0.3230	1281.4	0.3230	1639.4
21	0.0538	120.00	0.0538	96.300	0.0535	149.90	0.0536	108.90	0.0536	96.200
22	0.0792	215.00	0.0792	154.50	0.0789	279.50	0.0791	203.80	0.0791	200.00
23	0.1690	720.70	0.1691	344.50	0.1686	964.60	0.1689	695.00	0.1689	813.80
24	0.2706	1677.9	0.2706	430.20	0.2700	2201.4	0.2705	1547.6	0.2704	2038.3
25	0.0827	248.70	0.0827	172.80	0.0825	325.70	0.0825	237.50	0.0825	238.50
26	0.1711	798.10	0.1712	362.10	0.1710	1067.50	0.1710	767.40	0.1711	911.30
27	0.3188	2523.2	0.3188	337.10	0.3187	3238.4	0.3187	2236.3	0.3187	3129.6
28	0.1270	650.80	0.1270	326.60	0.1269	871.20	0.1268	628.90	0.1268	726.20
29	0.2366	1885.4	0.2366	419.20	0.2365	2460.2	0.2364	1721.5	0.2365	2306.0
30	0.1050	798.10	0.1051	362.10	0.1049	1067.5	0.1049	767.40	0.1049	911.30
31	0.1195	978.70	0.1195	394.30	0.1193	1305.5	0.1194	933.80	0.1195	1140.4
32	0.1840	1998.5	0.1840	409.80	0.1838	2600.1	0.1839	1814.9	0.1840	2452.1

Acknowledgements

The first author is grateful to CNPq for their finantial support, the second and third authors are grateful to CAPES for their financial support.

Appendix

We give explicit expressions for the cumulants and their derivatives, both defined in page 5. Further, we give the expressions for each quantity contained in equation (8), some of them are also deduced to help the reader who might be interested in checking the results.

We call attention for the fact that the expressions of the type contained in equation (8) from the Appendix of Ospina et al. (2006) are incorrect if we put a as ϕ. But this is a minor issue, and the formulae contained in the body of the text are correct.

Consider initially the following notation for the derivatives, and product of the derivatives, of the

predictor with respect to the regression parameters:

$$(rs)_i = \frac{\partial^2 \eta_{1i}}{\partial \beta_r \partial \beta_s}, \quad (RS)_i = \frac{\partial^2 \eta_{2i}}{\partial \theta_R \partial \theta_S}, \quad (rs,T)_i = \frac{\partial^2 \eta_{1i}}{\partial \beta_r \partial \beta_s}\frac{\partial \eta_{2i}}{\partial \theta_T},$$

and so on. Now, consider the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_i &= \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) + \psi'(\mu_i\phi_i),\\
b_i &= \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)(1-\mu_i)^2 + \psi'(\mu_i\phi_i)\mu_i^2 - \psi'(\phi_i),\\
c_i &= \psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \psi''(\mu_i\phi_i),\\
d_i &= \psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)(1-\mu_i)^2 - \psi''(\mu_i\phi_i)\mu_i^2,\\
e_i &= \psi''(\phi_i) - \psi''(\mu_i\phi_i)\mu_i^3 - \psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)(1-\mu_i)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

By using these quantities, the cumulants can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rs} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i^2 a_i \left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2 (r,s)_i,\\
\kappa_{rS} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i \{\mu_i a_i - \psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,S)_i,\\
\kappa_{RS} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 (R,S)_i,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rsu} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i^2 \left\{\phi_i c_i \left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^3 - 3a_i \frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\right\}(r,s,u)_i\\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i^2 a_i \left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2 \{(rs,u)_i + (ru,s)_i + (su,r)_i\},\\
\kappa_{rsU} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i \{2a_i + \phi_i\psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \phi_i\mu_i c_i\}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2 \frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,s,U)_i\\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i \{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i\}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,s,U)_i\\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i \{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(rs,U)_i,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rSU} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i\}\left\{2\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 + \phi_i \frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\right\}(r,S,U)_i\\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i d_i \frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 (r,S,U)_i\\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i \{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,SU)_i,\\
\kappa_{RSU} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{e_i \left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^3 - 3b_i \frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right\}(R,S,U)_i\\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 \{(RS,U)_i + (RU,S)_i + (SU,R)_i\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the second order cumulants with respect to the parameters, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rs}^{(u)} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i^2\left\{2a_i\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}-\phi_i c_i\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^3\right\}(r,s,u)_i \\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i^2 a_i\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\{(ru,s)_i+(su,r)_i\}, \\
\kappa_{rs}^{(U)} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\phi_i^2[\psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-\mu_i c_i]+2\phi_i a_i\right\}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,s,U)_i, \\
\kappa_{RS}^{(u)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\{d_i\phi_i+2\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-2\mu_i a_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2(R,S,u)_i, \\
\kappa_{RS}^{(U)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{e_i\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^3-2b_i\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\right\}(R,S,U)_i \\
&\quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n}b_i\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{\eta_{2i}}\right)^2\{(RU,S)_i+(SU,R)_i\},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rS}^{(u)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i\{\phi_i\mu_i c_i-\psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)\phi_i-a_i\}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,S,u)_i \\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-a_i\mu_i\}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(r,S,u)_i \\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-a_i\mu_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(ru,S)_i,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{rS}^{(U)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-a_i\mu_i+\phi_i d_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2(r,S,U)_i \\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-a_i\mu_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}(r,S,U)_i \\
&\quad +\sum_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)-a_i\mu_i\}\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}(SU,r)_i.
\end{aligned}$$

We now define the diagonal matrices

$$M_1 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_i^2}{2}\left[\phi_i c_i\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^3 - a_i\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\right]\right), \tag{20}$$

$$M_2 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_i^2}{2}\{\mu_i c_i - \psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i)\}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} + \phi_i\{\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - a_i\mu_i\}\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right) \tag{21}$$

$$M_3 = \text{diag}\left(-\frac{\phi_i}{2}\left\{[2a_i + \phi_i\psi''((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \phi_i\mu_i c_i]\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}} + [\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i]\frac{d^2\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}^2}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right\}\right), \tag{22}$$

$$M_4 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\{[d_i\phi_i + 2\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - 2\mu_i a_i]\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 - \phi_i[\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i]\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\right\}\right), \tag{23}$$

$$M_5 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_i}{2}\left\{d_i\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2 + [\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - \mu_i a_i]\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\right\}\right), \tag{24}$$

$$M_6 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[e_i\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^3 - b_i\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\frac{d^2\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}^2}\right]\right), \tag{25}$$

$$N_1 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_i^2 a_i}{2}\left(\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\right)^2\right), \tag{26}$$

$$N_2 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\phi_i}{2}[\psi'((1-\mu_i)\phi_i) - a_i\mu_i]\frac{d\mu_i}{d\eta_{1i}}\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right), \tag{27}$$

$$N_3 = \text{diag}\left(\frac{b_i}{2}\left(\frac{d\phi_i}{d\eta_{2i}}\right)^2\right). \tag{28}$$

Let now, m_{ji} be the ith diagonal element of the matrix M_j, and n_{ji} be the ith diagonal element of the matrix N_j. Thus, consider also the following matrices

$$L_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}\tilde{X}_i K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{Z}^T\delta_i,$$

$$L_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}\tilde{Z}_i K^{\beta\theta}\tilde{X}^T\delta_i,$$

where δ_i is an $n \times 1$ vector with a one in the ith position and zeros elsewhere.

From expressions (20) to (28) we get:

$$\kappa_{rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{1i}(r,s,u)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{1i}\{(rs,u)_i - (ru,s)_i - (su,r)_i\},$$

$$\kappa_{Rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{Rsu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{2i}(R,s,u)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(su,R)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{rS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{2i}(r,S,u)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(ru,S)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsU} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{3i}(r,s,U)_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(rs,U)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{RS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{4i}(R,S,u)_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(RS,u)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{Rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RsU} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{5i}(R,s,U)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(RU,s)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{rS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSU} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{5i}(r,S,U)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i}(SU,r)_i,$$

$$\kappa_{RS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSU} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{6i}(R,S,U)_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{3i}\{(RS,U)_i - (RU,S)_i - (SU,R)_i\}.$$

We are now in conditions to compute each term of expression (8):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r,s,u} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{su}\left\{\kappa_{rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsu}\right\} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{1i} \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(r)_i \sum_{s,u} \kappa^{su}(s,u)_i \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{1i} \sum_{r,s,u} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{su}\{(rs,u)_i - (ru,s)_i - (su,r)_i\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{1i} \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(r)_i \delta_i^T(\tilde{X}K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T)\delta_i \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{1i} \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(r)_i \sum_{s,u} \kappa^{su}(su)_i \\
&= \delta_a^T \sum_{i=1} K^{a\beta}\tilde{X}^T\delta_i m_{1i}\delta_i^T(\tilde{X}K^{\beta\beta}\tilde{X}^T)\delta_i \\
&\quad -\delta_a^T \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{1i}K^{a\beta}\tilde{X}_i\delta_i F_i \\
&= \delta_a^T K^{a\beta}\tilde{X}^T M_1 P_{\beta\beta} - \delta_a^T K^{a\beta}\tilde{X}^T N_1 F,
\end{aligned}$$

where $K^{a\beta}$ is the matrix $K^{\beta\beta}$ if $a = 1,\ldots,k$ and is $K^{\beta\theta}$ if $a = k+1,\ldots,k+h$, further, if $a = k+1,\ldots,k+h$, we use the abuse of notation δ_a to mean δ_{a-h}, also, the matrices $P_{\beta\beta}$, F_i and F were defined in page 6. Similarly, we obtain,

$$\sum_{R,s,u} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{su}\left\{\kappa_{Rs}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{Rsu}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\theta}\tilde{Z}^T M_2 P_{\beta\beta} + \delta_a^T K^{a\theta}\tilde{Z}^T N_2 F,$$

where, $K^{a\theta}$ is $K^{\beta\theta}$ if $a = 1, \ldots, k$ and is $K^{\theta\theta}$ if $a = k+1, \ldots, k+h$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r,S,u} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{Su}\left\{\kappa_{rS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSu}\right\} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{2i} \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(r)_i \sum_{S,u} \kappa^{Su}(S,u)_i \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i} \sum_{S,u} \kappa^{Su}(S)_i \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(ur)_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{2i} \sum_{r} \kappa^{ar}(r)_i \delta_i^T (\tilde{X} K^{\beta\theta} \tilde{Z}^T)\delta_i \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i} \sum_{S,u} \kappa^{Su}(S)_i \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}_i \delta_u \\
&= \delta_a^T \sum_{i=1} K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}^T \delta_i m_{2i} \delta_i^T (\tilde{X} K^{\beta\beta} \tilde{Z}^T)\delta_i \\
&\quad + \delta_a^T \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{2i} \sum_{u} K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}_i \delta_u \delta_u^T K^{\beta\theta} \tilde{Z}^T \delta_i \\
&= \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}^T M_2 P_{\beta\theta} + \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} L_1.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, we have

$$\sum_{r,s,U} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{sU}\left\{\kappa_{rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rsU}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}^T M_3 P_{\beta\theta} - \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} L_1,$$

where $P_{\beta\theta}$ was defined in page 6. Now, analogously we have,

$$\sum_{R,S,u} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{Su}\left\{\kappa_{RS}^{(u)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSu}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} \tilde{Z}^T M_4 P_{\beta\theta} - \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} L_2,$$

$$\sum_{R,s,U} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{sU}\left\{\kappa_{Rs}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RsU}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} \tilde{Z}^T M_5 P_{\beta\theta} + \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} L_2,$$

$$\sum_{r,S,U} \kappa^{ar}\kappa^{SU}\left\{\kappa_{rS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{rSU}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} \tilde{X}^T M_5 P_{\theta\theta} + \delta_a^T K^{a\beta} \tilde{X} N_2 G,$$

where G was defined in page 6. Finally, we have

$$\sum_{R,S,U} \kappa^{aR}\kappa^{SU}\left\{\kappa_{RS}^{(U)} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{RSU}\right\} = \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} \tilde{Z}^T M_6 P_{\theta\theta} - \delta_a^T K^{a\theta} \tilde{Z}^T N_3 G.$$

References

[1] Atkinson, A.C., 1985. *Plots, transformation and regression.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

[2] Barroso, L.P., Cordeiro,G.M., Vasconcellos, K.L.P., 2002. Second-order asymptotic for score tests in heteroscedastic t regression models. *Comm. Statist. - Theory Methods* 31, 1515-1529.

[3] Botter, D.A., Cordeiro, G.M., 1997. Bartlett corrections for generalized linear models with dispersion covariates. *Comm. Statist. - Theory Methods* 26, 279-307.

[4] Botter, D.A., Cordeiro, G.M., 1998. Improved estimators for generalized linear models with dispersion covariates. *J. Statist. Comput. Simul.* 62, 91-104.

[5] Carrol, R.J., Ruppert, D., 1988. On robust test for heteroscedasticity. *Ann. Statist.* 48, 133-169.

[6] Cook, R.D., Tsai, C.L., Wei, B.C., 1986. Bias in nonlinear regression. *Biometrika* 73, 615-623.

[7] Cook, R.D., Weisberg, S., 1983. Diagnostics for heteroscedasticity in regression. *Biometrika* 70, 1-10.

[8] Cordeiro, G.M., McCullagh, P., 1991. Bias correction in generalized linear models. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **B** 53, 629-643.

[9] Cordeiro, G.M., Paula, G.A., 1989. Improved likelihood ratio statistics for exponential family nonlinear models. *Biometrika*, 76, 93-100.

[10] Cordeiro, G.M., Rocha, E.C., Rocha, J.G.C., Cribari-Neto, F., 1997. Bias-corrected maximum likelihood estimation for the beta distribution. *J. Statist. Compt. Simul.* 58, 21-35.

[11] Cox, D.R., Hinkley, D.V., 1974. *Theoretical Statistics.* Chapman & Hall, London.

[12] Cox, D.R., Snell, E., 1968. A general definition of residuals. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **B** 30, 248-275.

[13] Cribari-Neto, F., Vasconcellos, K.L.P., 2002. Nearly unbiased maximum likelihood estimation for the beta distribution. *J. Statist. Comput. Simul.* 72, 107-118.

[14] Cysneiros, F.J.A., Paula, G.A., Galea, M., 2007. Heteroscedastic symmetrical linear models. *Statist. Probab. Letters* 77, 1084-1090.

[15] Efron, B., 1979. Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife. *Ann. Statist.* 7, 1-26.

[16] Ferrari, S. L. P., Cribari-Neto, F., 2004. Beta regression for modeling rates and proportions. *J. Appl. Statist.* 31, 799-815.

[17] Firth, D., 1993. Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* 80, 27-38.

[18] Jørgensen, B., 1997. *The theory of dispersion models.* Chapman & Hall, London.

[19] Harvey, A.C., 1976. Estimating regression models with multiplicative heteroscedasticity. *Econometrika*, 41, 461-465.

[20] Kieschnick, R., McCullough, B., 2003. Regression analysis of variates observed on $(0, 1)$: percentages, proportions, and fractions. *Statist. Model.* 3, 193-213.

[21] Lawley, D., 1956. A general method for approximating to the distribution of likelihood ratio criteria. *Biometrika* 43, 295-303.

[22] MacKinnon, J.G., Smith Jr., A.A., 1998. Approximate bias correction in econometrics. *J. Econometrics* 85, 205-230.

[23] McCullagh, P., Nelder, J., 1989. *Generalized linear models.* second ed. Chapman & Hall, London.

[24] Ospina, R., Cribari-Neto, F., Vasconcellos, K.L.P., 2006. Improved point and interval estimation for a beta regression model. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* 51, 960-981.

[25] Paolino, P., 2001. Maximum likelihood estimation of models with beta-distributed dependent variables. *Political Anal.* 9, 325-346.

[26] Park, R.E., 1966. Estimating with heteroscedastic terms. *Econometrika*, 34, 888.

[27] Pike, M.C., Hill, A.P., Smith, P.G., 1980. Bias and efficiency in logistic analyses of stratified casecontrole studies. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 9, 89-95.

[28] Prater, N.H., 1956. Estimate gasoline yields from crude. *Petroleum Refiner*, 35, 236-238

[29] Press, W.H., Teukolsky, S.A., Vetterling, W.T., Flannery, B.P., 1992. *Numerical recipes in C: The art of scientific computing.* second ed. Cambridge University Press, New York.

[30] Ratkowsky, D.A., 1983. *Nonlinear regression modeling.* Marcel Dekker, New York.

[31] Smyth, G.K., 1989. Generalized linear models with varying dispersion. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **B** 51, 47-60.

[32] Taylor, J., Verbyla, A., 2004. Joint modelling of location and scale parameter of the t distribution. *Statist. Model.* 4, 91-112.

[33] Vasconcellos, K.L.P., Cribari-Neto, F., 2005. Improved maximum likelihood estimation in a new class of beta regression models. *Brazilian J. Probab. Statist.* 19, 13-31.

[34] Verbyla, A.P., 1993. Modelling variance heterogeneity: residual maximum likelihood and diagnostics. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.,* **B** 55, 493-508.